Volume 47 ISSN 0042-6032

A review of early christian life and language

Vigiliae Christianae

editors-in-chief

J. den Boeft, Amsterdam
R. van den Broek, Utrecht
A. F. J. Klijn, Groningen
G. Quispel, Utrecht
J. C. M. van Winden, Leiden

associate editors

M. Anastos, Los Angeles
A. Davids, Nijmegen
R. M. Grant, Chicago
Marguerite Harl, Paris
J.-P. Mahé, Paris
Elaine Pagels, Princeton
D. T. Runia, Leiden
R. Staats, Kiel

E. J. BRILL
Leiden

© *Copyright 1993 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands*

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by E. J. Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to Copyright Clearance Center, 27 Congress Street, Salem MA 01970, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

I. ARTICLES

ALLEN, P. and MAYER, W., Computer and Homily: Accessing the Everyday Life of Early Christians 260
BAARDA, T., John 1:5 in the *Oration* and *Diatessaron* of Tatian. Concerning the Reading KATAΛAMBANEI 209
BARTELINK, G.J.M., Les Apophthegmes des Pères. A propos de deux études récentes 390
DE JONGE, M., The Transmission of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs by Christians 1
DOIGNON, J., Souvenirs cicéroniens (Hortensius, Consolation) et virgiliens dans l'exposé d'Augustin sur l'état humain d'"ignorance et de difficulté" (Aug., *lib.arb.* 3, 51-54) 131
EHRMANN, B.D., Heracleon, Origen, and the Text of the Fourth Gospel 105
ENO, R.B., The Significance of the Lists of Roman Bishops in the Anti-Donatist Polemic 158
ERNEST, J.D., Athanasius of Alexandria: The Scope of Scripture in Polemical and Pastoral Context 341
HAAS, CH., The Arians of Alexandria 234
HANSEN, G.CH., Zwei Splitter frühchristlicher Literatur 85
HARL, M., La «Bible d'Alexandrie» et les études sur la Septante. Réflexions sur une première expérience 313
JOEST, CH., Proverbia 6,3 und die Bruderliebe bei den Pachomianern 119
KRUEGER, D., Diogenes the Cynic among the Fourth Century Fathers 29
KRUSE, H., "Gemeinschaft der Heiligen". Herkunft und Bedeutung des Glaubensartikels 246
LOESSL, J., *Religio, Philosophia* und *Pulchritudo*. Ihr Zusammenhang nach Augustinus, *De vera religione* 363
MAYER, see ALLEN
QUISPEL, G. A Diatessaron Reading in a Latin Manichean Codex 374
REBENICH, S.: Jerome: The "Vir trilinguis" and the "Hebraica veritas" 50
SIVAN, H., Anician Women, The Cento of Proba, and Aristocratic Conversion in the Fourth Century 140
STORY, C.I.K., Ignatius to the Romans 2:1c 226
TUBACH, J., Synkellos' Kalendar der Hebräer 379
VINZENT, M., Gottes Wesen, Logos, Weisheit und Kraft bei Asterius von Kappadokien und Markell von Ankyra 170
WOODS, D., A Historical Source of the Passio Typasii 78

II REVIEWS

ACERBI, A., *L'Ascensione di Isaia. Cristologia et profetismo in Siria nei Primi decenni del II secolo* (H.J.W. Drijvers) 303

ATTRIDGE W. *and* HATA, G., *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism* (J.C.M. van Winden) 93
Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt, Teil II, Band 16, 3. und 4. Teilband (D.T. Runia) 95
BALIDO, *see* PALLAND
BERNARDI, J., *Grégoire de Nazianze, Discours 42-43* (J.C.M. van Winden) 197
BEULAY, R., *L'enseignement spirituel de Jean de Dalyatha, mystique syro-oriental du viiie siècle* (H.J.W. Drijvers) 411
BIRAUD, *see* GRANAROLO
BORRET, *see* MESSIÉ
CALLAHAN, J.F., *Gregorii Nysseni, De oratione dominica, De beatitudinibus* (J.C.M. van Winden) 93
DILLON, J. *The Golden Chain* (J. Mansfeld) 305
DI PILLA, *see* PALLAND
DISCROL, J., *The 'Ad Monachos' of Evagrius Ponticus. Its Structure and a Select Commentary* (J.C.M. van Winden) 410
DOUTRELEAU, L., *Didyme l'Aveugle, Traité du Saint-Esprit* (J.C.M. van Winden) 404
DUPLEIX, A., *Recherches et Tradition. Festschrift H. Crouzel* (survey) 310
GIVERSEN, see VAN TONGERLOO
GOULET-CAZÉ, M.-O., MADEC, G., O'BRIEN, D. ΣΟΦΙΗΣ ΜΑΙΗΤΟΡΕΣ *Chercheurs de Sagesse. Festschrift J. Pépin* (survey) 311
GRANAROLO, J. avec BIRAUD, M., *Autour de Tertullien. Hommage à René Braun* (survey) 309
HANSON, R.P.C., *Hermias, Satire des philosophes païens* (J.C.M. van Winden) . 401
HATA, *see* ATTRIDGE
HOFFMANN, A., *Augustinus, De utilitate credendi/Über den Nutzen des Glaubens* (J. van Oort) 288
HOFFMANN, A., *Augustins Schrift 'De utilitate credendi': Einleitung, Übersetzung, Analyse.* (J. van Oort) 288
KACZINSKI, R., *Johannes Chrysostomus, Catecheses baptismales/Taufkatechesen* (J.C.M. van Winden) 198
KLEIN, W.W., *Die Argumentation in den griechisch-christlichen Antimanichaica* (J. van Oort) 201
KLIMKEIT, *see* WIESSNER
KOSCHORKE, K., *Spuren der alten Liebe. Studien zum Kirchenbegriff des Basilius von Caesarea* (J.C.M. van Winden) 196
LELOIR, L. *Écrits Apocryphes sur les Apôtres* (A.T.J. Klijn) 91
LIEU, S.N.C., *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China* (J. van Oort) 297
LINDEMANN, A., *Die Clemensbriefe* (A.F.J. Klijn) 90
MARIN, *see* PALLAND
MCWILLIAM, J., *Augustine: From Rhetor to Theologian* (J. den Boeft) 283
MESSIÉ, P., NEYRAND, L., BORRET, M., *Origène, Homélies sur les Juges* (J.C.M. van Winden) 403
MIQUEL, P., *Le vocabulaire de l'expérience spirituelle dans la tradition patristique grecque du IVe au XIVe siècle* (G.J.M. Bartelink) 287

NEYRAND, *see* MESSIÉ
NICHTWEISS, B., *Erik Petersen, Neue Sicht auf Leben und Werk* (G. Quispel) ... 101
O'DALY, G., *The Poetry of Boethius* (J. den Boeft) ... 206
PALLAND, G., BALIDO, G., RIES, J., DI PILLA, A., MARIN, M., *"De Genesi contra Manichaeos" "De Genesi ad litteram liber imperfectus" di Agostino d'Ippona* (J. van Oort) ... 296
PAPADOPOULOS, S.G., *Patrologia, II Ho tetartos aiônas* (A. Davids) ... 88
PERRONE, L. (ed.), *Il cuore indurito del Faraone. Origene e il problema del libero arbitrio* (Ph.J. van der Eijk) ... 399
POUDERON, B., *Athénagore, Supplique au sujet des chrétiens et Sur la résurrection des morts* (G.J.M. Bartelink) ... 285
PRESTEL, P., *Die Rezeption der ciceronischen Rhetorik durch Augustinus in 'de doctrina Christiana'* (J. den Boeft) ... 281
PRICOCO, S., *Monaci, filosofi e santi* (J. den Boeft) ... 284
REES, B.R., *The Letters of Pelagius and his Followers* (J. den Boeft) ... 192
REGTUIT, R.F., *Severian of Gabala, Homily on the Incarnation of Christ (CPG 4204)* (J.C.M. van Winden) ... 406
RÖDER, J.-A., *Gregor von Nyssa, Contra Eunomium I 1-146* (J.C.M. van Winden) 405
RÖWEKAMP, G., *Cyrill von Jerusalem, Mystagogicae Catecheses/Mystagogische Catechesen* (J.C.M. van Winden) ... 200
RUGGIERO, F., *Tertulliano, De corona* (J. den Boeft) ... 398
SCOURFIELD, J.H., *Consoling Heliodorus. A Commentary on Jerome Letter 60* (G.J.M. Bartelink) ... 194
SIEBEN, H.J., *Origenes, In Lucam Homiliae/Homilien zum Lukasevangelium* (J.C.M. van Winden) ... 92
STERLING, G.E., *Historiography and Self-Definition. Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (P.W. van der Horst) ... 203
VAN DEN BROEK, R. *alii, Knowledge of God in the Graeco-Roman World* (survey) 102
VAN TONGERLOO, A. AND GIVERSEN, S., *Manichaica Selecta. Studies presented to Professor Julien Ries* (J. van Oort) ... 291
WIESSNER, G. *und* KLIMKEIT, H.-J., *Studia Manichaica II. Internazionaler Kongress zum Manichaeismus (6.10. August 1989, St. Augustin/Bonn)* (J. van Oort) 294

Vigiliae Christianae 47 (1993), 1-28, E.J. Brill, Leiden

THE TRANSMISSION OF THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS BY CHRISTIANS

BY

M. DE JONGE

0. Introduction

The so-called Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament are generally studied as Jewish writings; they are regarded as sources for the history and thought of Judaism in the time between 200 before to 100 after the beginning of the common era. Scholars realize, of course, that they were transmitted by Christians; sometimes they were interpolated or redacted more thoroughly, sometimes they were handed down seemingly free from contamination. Research has centered around efforts to reconstruct the earliest Jewish form of these writings with the help of all available critical methods.

Should these pseudepigrapha, however, not also be studied as part of the Christian heritage? They were transmitted because copyists regarded them as important. Transmission presupposes the relevance of what is handed down; this applies to early Christianity as well as to the Middle Ages. Are we in a position to say something about the importance of these writings for Christians in different periods of history, and about their function(s) in Christian circles? In the following pages an effort will be made to answer these questions in the case of one influential pseudepigraphon, much studied in recent times, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.*

1. Recent studies on the place of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs in the early Church

Rather than giving an exhaustive survey of the recent literature dealing with the relation between the clearly Christian elements and the other passages in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, I may for the sake of brevity refer to my article "The Testaments of the Twelve

Patriarchs: Christian and Jewish. A hundred years after Friedrich Schnapp,"[1] in which the problem is discussed briefly on the basis of a number of earlier studies from my hand. Also § 8 "The Testaments in the Early Church", pp. 67-82 in H. W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Commentary*[2] offers an informative survey of the problem and the data available for reaching a solution. Since then I have carried the discussion further in two contributions to *Festschriften*; first an article entitled "Die Paränese in den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und in den Testamenten der Zwölf Patriarchen. Einige Überlegungen" written in honour of R. Schnackenburg,[3] and, second, in an essay "Rachel's virtuous behavior in the Testament of Issachar," written for A. J. Malherbe.[4] In so far as the considerations in these studies have a direct bearing on the subject at issue now, they will be discussed in the course of the present article.

2. The medieval witnesses to the text of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs

2.0 This paper is intended to investigate the transmission of the Testaments in the early Church. Yet it is thanks to the fact that also Christians from later ages were interested in these writings that they have come down to us at all. The Greek manuscripts, our primary witnesses to the text of the Testaments, date from the end of the tenth century (Cambridge, Univ. Library, Ff I.24, ff. 203r.-261v. = *b*) up to the eighteenth century (Mt. Sinai, Monastery of St. Catherine, Cod. Gr. 2170 (= 608), ff. 8r.-88r. = *j*, the last of a series of three closely related manuscripts in this monastery, and the Modern Greek translation in Bibl. Acad. Bucharest, Cod. Gr. 508 (341), ff. 7r.-120r. = Ngr).[5] It is obvious that we have to look in the Greek codices for indications why the text was transcribed. But first we have to give our attention to the data relating to the transfer of the oldest manuscript of the Testaments, the codex *b* just mentioned, to the West and its translation into Latin.

2.1 Robert Grosseteste (ca. 1170-1253) and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs

Around 1242 Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln, translated the Testaments from Greek into Latin, with the assistance of a certain Nicholas the Greek. Shortly before, he had sent John of Basingstoke to

Greece with the purpose of tracking down the Greek Testaments. In the Leiden volume *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* H. J. de Jonge has given extensive information on this,[6] and the present author has been able to supply some additional information in a recent study.[7]

For this paper I concentrate on two clearly related data: the reports on the finding of the Testaments and their translation in the Chronicle of Grosseteste's contemporary Matthew Paris[8] as well as in the colophon which occurs already in a thirteenth-century manuscript of the Latin translation[9] and must have been added at a very early date—possibly already by Nicholas the Greek, like Matthew attached to the Abbey of St. Albans. Some matters are brought emphatically to the fore there.

In the first place, attention is repeatedly drawn to the many and distinct prophecies concerning Christ which are to be found in the Testaments. Matthew Paris mentions the "manifestas quae in eisdem patent de Christo Prophetias"[10] and the colophon "luculentae ('clear, reliable') prophetiae, quae in hoc scripto, luce clarius, coruscant ('glow, sparkle')." Matthew Paris adds that the Testaments are indisputably "de substantia Bibliothecae." "Bibliotheca" is a designation of the Bible current in the Middle Ages. In his opinion, the Testaments clearly contained "biblical material". Of course they did not as such belong to the canonical writings, but as to their substance they certainly ranked among them.

Why had these important witnesses concerning Christ remained hidden for such a long time? The colophon blames this on the Jews, and speaks about "invidia Iudaeorum, qui ea propter evidentissimas et manifestissimas, ac crebras de Christo prophetias, quae in iis scribuntur, diu occultaverunt," and Matthew Paris uses much the same terms.[11] That explains why many learned and wise men in the Church never quoted the Testaments. We owe it to the Greeks, "omnium scriptorum diligentissimi investigatores", that this writing has been translated from Hebrew into Greek[12] and was preserved over a long time so that now, thanks to Robert Grosseteste, it could radiate its glorious light, intended "ad robur fidei Christianae et ad majorem Judaeorum confusionem."[13]

Robert Grosseteste *cum suis* evidently used the Testaments to make abundantly clear to Jews and all possible adversaries of the true doctrine that salvation is to be expected exclusively from Jesus Christ and from

the true Church that abides by Scripture. As early as 1253 Vincent of Beauvais incorporated excerpts from the Testaments in his *Speculum Historiale* because of their extremely clear and utterly beautiful prophecies concerning Christ, "quas nuper transtulit magister robertus grossum caput, lincolniensis episcopus de greco in latinum".[14] Bonaventura, too, in his Commentary on the Sententiae from 1250-1252[15] already quotes from the Testaments in Grosseteste's Latin translation, which in view of the number of transmitted manuscripts (no less than fifteen from the thirteenth century alone) must have been very popular from the start.

Highly interesting, finally, are two references to the Testaments in Roger Bacon's *Opus Majus* from 1266-1268,[16] in which he elaborates Matthew Paris's brief remark "quae constat esse de substantia Bibliothecae". In Pars II, cap. XVI he says that patriarchs and prophets have written other books beside those that are included in the Holy Scripture; books which, though not incorporated in the canon, have been used by "sancti et sapientes Graeci et Latini" right from the beginning of the Church.[17] Indeed did not Judas, for instance, already use Enoch in his Epistle (vv. 14-15)? We may, therefore, assign authority to the prophecies concerning Christ which proved to be correct. Elsewhere, in Pars VII, cap. IV[18] he says: If one objects that those writings are apocryphal and that therefore their authorship is not established, one should remember: "hoc non tollit veritatem quia libri hi recipiuntur a Graecis, Latinis, et Judaeis." The addition "Judaeis" here deserves special attention. Much as the Jews may have tried to suppress the witness of their patriarchs, in the final analysis the Christians are dependent on their tradition. In a letter from 1231 Grosseteste quotes St. Augustine's exegesis of Ps. 58:12 in the Vulgate, in which this Church Father argues that it is not allowed to kill the Jews, because they "portant codices nostros, de quibus prophetatus et promissus est nobis Christus". Indeed, Grosseteste continues, "ac per hoc sunt testes fidei Christianae contra infidelitatem Paganorum."[19]

2.2 Indications in Greek manuscripts

In a great number of Greek manuscripts we find additions in the margin, and occasionally also in the text, which, contrary to the equally frequent omissions,[20] give us information on the intention of the scribes involved. Frequently[21] we find in the margin the gloss περὶ χριστοῦ, not

surprising after what just has been remarked about Grosseteste c.s. In Ms *m* (= Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ms Gr. 60, pp. 339-482), dating from the second half of the sixteenth century, we find at the end of the Testament of Benjamin (therefore at the end of the Testaments) the note

> καὶ προσπάγητε πάντα πρὸς νόμον κυρίου καὶ κριτοῦ τῶν ἁπάντων, ἵνα εὕρητε αὐτὸν ἵλεων, ὅταν ἥξῃ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ γενηθήσεται ὥσπερ νήπιον ἐκ γυναικός· καὶ αὐτὸς δίδαξει ἡμᾶς πᾶσαν διδαχὴν πνευματικὴν ἐν ταπεινώσει, καὶ παθῶν παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἕως μέχρι ἀναληφθῆναι εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενος μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ. ("And be in everything connected with the law of the Lord and the Judge of the universe, that you will find him merciful when he comes from heaven and is born of a woman as a small child. And he will teach you all spiritual teachings in humility, and, having suffered on the part of the Jews until his assumption into the heavens, return with glory to pass judgment on Israel in justice and truth").

This passage substitutes a much more extensive testamentary final passage in T. B. 10,2-11 (in which the response of the patriarch's descendants to Jesus as human being on earth and his future judgment figure prominently) as well as chapter 11 (in which "a beloved of the Lord" of Benjamin's seed comes on the scene). It is followed by an abridged version of the final chapter T. B. 12, which also occurs in virtually the same form in Ms *d* (= Cod. Vat. Gr. 1238, ff. 350r-379v; saec. XII). T. B. 11, by the way, has, for obvious reasons, in another manuscript, *l* (= Athos, Laura I 48 [cat. no. 1132], ff. 204r-276r; saec. XVI-XVII) the marginal note περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου Παύλου· καὶ γὰρ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς αὐτοῦ ἦν.[22]

It is relevant here to dwell for a moment on three manuscripts: *b* (the one used by Grosseteste); *d*, just mentioned, a manuscript from Calabria written in 1195[23]; and *k* (= Venice, S. Marc. Cod. Gr. Z. 494 (= 331]), a manuscript containing excerpts from the Testaments on ff. 263r-264v., and dating from the middle of the thirteenth century.

In the case of *b* attention should be called to four marginal notes. T. R. 6,8 carries προφητεία περὶ χῦ; T.S. 6,7 προφητεία περὶ τῆς ἐνσάρκου οἰκονομίας; T.L. 2,10 περὶ τοῦ χῦ and T.L. 4,1 πε<ρὶ> τῆς σταυρώσεως τοῦ χῦ λέγ<εται>. It is possible, though not absolutely certain, that these glosses stem from the author of the manuscript himself.[24]

An interesting case is *d*. Not only did the writer of the text add περὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ in the margin some thirty times, but in addition to this we find four Greek *marginalia* by a later hand, consisting of T.R. 6,8.11-12; T. Jud. 23,5; 24,1-2; T.G. 7,1; 8,1; T.A. 7,2-3.3-4, the text of which

does not correspond with the text of the manuscript itself. In all cases it is a matter of Christological passages, and in all cases we find (shorter) Latin passages added; the text of the latter corresponds with that of fragments incorporated in the *Speculum Historiale* of Vincent of Beauvais, mentioned in the preceding section. H. J. de Jonge, who has carried out a thorough investigation into the matter, concludes that the choice and the extent of the marginal notes (not the text itself) are determined by the Latin fragments in Vincent of Beauvais's book. Vincent, as we have seen was above all fascinated by the "apertissimae atque pulcherrimae de christo prophetiae" in the Testaments.[25]

Finally there are the fragments in *k*. First rather long ones, with a general introduction, from T. Reuben, T. Simeon and T. Levi, but with T. Judah things begin to change. Although the introduction announces that the testament is concerned with courage and avarice, the excerpt proper is limited to T. Jud 21,7-end in an abridged version, characterised as περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ. Nothing has been taken over from T. Issachar, for, as the introduction tells us, οὗτος οὐδέν τι περὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ ἐφθέγξατο. All of the other seven excerpts restrict themselves to the eschatological passages at the end of the Testaments; the introductions briefly mention the parenesis in the testament concerned, and then announce what the patriarch had to say about the Christ. Interestingly the final exhortation about the "pure disposition" in T.B. 8 is incorporated.[26] It is clear that the scribe of these excerpts, or possibly already the writer of his *Vorlage*, was first of all interested in the Christological passages.

Summarizing: the data in the Greek manuscripts known to us point in the same direction as the reports about Grosseteste and his contemporaries. All users of the Testaments were concerned with references to Christ.

2.3 The ethical exhortations in the Testaments

The Testaments are, however, distinctly a parenetic writing, as is evident from their structure and design. Could so obvious a fact have escaped the scholars in the Middle Ages and later? This is a point that clearly requires further investigation.

H. J. de Jonge, however, pointed out to me that the East Middle Dutch translation (from Latin) of the Testaments, which we have in three mutually independent manuscripts,[27] has clearly been transmitted with

parenetic intentions. This is evident from the short prologue and epilogue with which the translator provided the writing. Thus he says, at the end: "Here end the sermons and the testaments of the twelve patriarchs children of Jacob the patriarch which they made at the very end of their lives in which they narrate a part of their lives with a variety of good examples and teaching which they taught to their children and commanded to practise."[28]

We may take it for granted that this translation was made in circles of adherents of the Modern Devotion, a movement that has produced a vast body of literature in the vernacular aimed at the *praxis pietatis*. In one of the manuscripts (Nijmegen, Gemeentearchief, Weeshuis no. 957) we find, besides the Testaments, the text of a Dutch translation of *De spiritualibus* ("Van der opclimminghen") from the hand of Gerard Zerbolt van Zutphen († 1398, a prominent pupil of Geert Grote).[29]

There is yet another Dutch translation, made in 1538. Its oldest Dutch printing dates from 1541, published by Albertus Palfraet in Deventer. All of its five or six printings between 1541 and ca. 1550 appeared in Overijssel, in the East of the Netherlands; after 1551 the translation appears in all sorts of editions in the Southern Netherlands.[30] C. C. de Bruin and H. J. de Jonge have associated them with the chiliastic movement of David Joris (active in the Netherlands between ca. 1528 and 1540). This would explain why this translation was put on the index of prohibited books.[31]

In any case the readers of this second translation were not only interested in the parenetic parts but also in the prophecies in the Testaments. On the title page of the edition that appeared in 1544 with Pieter Warnerszoon in Kampen we read: "The testaments of the XII patriarchs Jacob's children, how each before his end taught his children (to live in) the fear of the Lord and exhorted (them) to live a God-fearing life. Also how each particularly through the prophetic spirit witnessed to Christ the true Messiah (clearer than that light). In which are contained much magnificent teaching and many consoling promises by Christ very consoling and altogether inducive to a God-fearing life."[32] It is significant that precisely the second half of this passage (from "Also how each.." onward) is omitted on the title pages of the three printings of the Testaments by Plantijn, dating from 1561, 1564 and 1566.[33] Plantijn—also, by the way, the printer of the Index (1570)—evidently thought it well-advised to omit the reference to the prophetic spirit.

These forms of reception of the Testaments, in the Netherlands and elsewhere, deserve more attention. One could, for instance, assume with good reason, that in the monasteries in which the Testaments were transcribed, in the East as well as in the West, the ethical content of this writing was well received. But within the scope of this paper we have to go back from the Middle Ages to, in the end, the early Church. What can be said, on the basis of the transmission in the Middle Ages, about that in the preceding period?

3. The Testaments prior to the tenth century

3.1 The transition from uncial to minuscule

Our oldest Greek textual witness Ms. *b* dates from the end of the tenth century. As the Leiden research has established, it belongs, together with Ms. *k.* to one small family, called family I. All other textual witnesses (including the Armenian, Slavonic and Serbian translations) belong to family II. How old, then, is the archetype of the tradition known to us?

H. J. de Jonge, who has made a substantial contribution to the reconstruction of the *stemma codicum* employed in the Leiden *editio maior*,[34] devoted an important article to this question in the volume *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (1975).[35] On the basis of an examination of thirteen passages showing different readings in fam. I and fam. II, he concludes that the Testaments were transcribed not once but twice in the ninth century, when the transition was made from uncial to minuscule. In fact, the variants concerned can best be explained on the basis of a wrong or at least divergent reading of uncial script. If the Testaments were transcribed from uncial to minuscule script two times, the odds are that also two different uncial manuscripts were used. And if this is the case, the archetype of the textual tradition known to us must go back beyond the ninth century. How far back it is impossible to establish.

3.2 The Armenian translation

The next question to be considered is whether the translations from Greek into other languages help us to trace an older stage of textual tradition. As a case in point we may mention the example of the Testament of Job, transmitted in three Greek manuscripts, the oldest of which

dates from the eleventh century,[36] and that of the Testament of Abraham, a writing with a very intricate textual tradition but equally lacking a Greek manuscript older than the eleventh century.[37] We now have a fragmentary Coptic version of both Testaments, found in the fifth-century P. Colon. Inv. no. 3221.[38] Unfortunately this version has as yet not been published, nor has it been incorporated in theories about the transmission of the text of T. Job and T. Abraham, but it is clearly of utmost importance.

In the case of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs efforts have been made to go farther back by means of the Armenian translation, known in more than fifty manuscripts and clearly very popular in the Armenian church. In an article from 1969[39] C. Burchard dated the translation to the sixth or seventh century on the strength of the kind of Armenian employed, and M. E. Stone concurred.[40] To prove this, however, turned out to be far from easy.

The earliest Armenian manuscripts date from the thirteenth century,[41] and the oldest list of sacred writings mentioning the Testaments is that of Johannes Sarkawag of Halbat (1045/55-1129?). Burchard says that Johannes knew the Testaments in Armenian, but M. E. Stone believes it quite possible that he quoted a list of Greek writings.[42] If this is so he cannot be adduced as an indubitable witness for the Armenian text of the Testaments.

The place of the Armenian translation in the *stemma codicum* is reasonably certain.[43] It belongs to fam. II and, like *eafchij*Ngr and the Slavonic translation, it has an abridged, secondary text in T. Zebulun.[44] It does not share many other secondary readings in that group, but shows many points of similarity with (manuscripts belonging to) subfamily *gldm*Fm^{d}; consequently A has to be situated between these two subfamilies. The oldest witness for the short version of T. Zebulun is *e* (= Ms. Athos, Koutloumous 39 [cat. no. 3108], ff. 198r-229v), a manuscript dating from the eleventh century. It is not certain when the abridgment was made, but as regards the Greek material it need not have been before the tenth or eleventh century. In 1975 I therefore concluded, referring to H. J. de Jonge's argument concerning the transliteration from uncial to minuscule script: "The Armenian translation is very unlikely to be earlier than the IXth century. We should be cautious, therefore, to put the Armenian translation in the VIth or VIIth century on the basis of the impression made by its language alone. Surely the possibility may not be excluded that some scribe at a later

date deliberately used classical or classicizing language for a writing like the Testaments which purported to come from ancient times. What we really need is unequivocal early external evidence for A."[45]

Research has, of course, continued. Two persons in particular who have contributed to it deserve special mention. I briefly mention A. Hultgård, who in his *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches II*,[46] 11-52 extensively discussed the textual problems of the Testaments with special attention for the position of the Armenian translation. He assumes four textual types: *bk, gldm, eafnchij*/SNGr and A, which independently go back to archetypes from the third or fourth century. For the reconstruction of the archetype we need all four types, and consequently also the Armenian version;[47] obviously they existed already before the ninth century—even though Hultgård cannot adduce evidence for transliteration in the case of *gldm* and *eafnchij*, and his arguments for the dependence of A on a Greek text written in uncials are not convincing.

In any case he considers A as very important for the reconstruction of the oldest Greek text. In agreement with M. E. Stone, he says that in general the Armenian version offers a shorter text and occasionally redacts radically; this will have been so right from the beginning of the translation in the fifth or sixth century, and will have continued subsequently. All the same Hultgård uses singular Armenian readings whenever it suits him; as I have tried to demonstrate elsewhere, his text-critical analysis is not very precise, methodically speaking; and now and then he handles criteria of internal criticism in a very subjective manner.

More important than Hultgård's contribution is that of Stone in a recent article.[48] In the oldest Armenian manuscript on paper, Erevan, Matenadaran no. 2679, dating from 981, we find on ff. 251r-252r excerpts from the Testaments. Though unimportant as to their literary value for lack of a clear line and purpose, these excerpts are very important from the point of view of textual history and textual criticism. This "Epitome" (as Stone calls it) gives a text that is not directly dependent on that of any of the other witnesses which can be divided into four textual types.[49] Stone reconstructs a simple *stemma*, and concludes that prior to the Epitome not only an archetype, but also a hyparchetype has to be assumed. There are, moreover, quite a few contaminations, and he therefore concludes: "Since the *Epitome* is as old as the oldest Greek witness, its ancestor must be older, perhaps notably older than that. This implies that the *Vorlage* of Armenian on the Greek stemma is most

likely of the eighth century or earlier and in any case no later than the early ninth century at the very latest."[50] It is clear that the first half of the ninth century just fits in with H. J. de Jonge's reconstruction of the transliteration process, whereas an earlier dating leads to considerable difficulties. Yet Stone, on stylistic grounds, is very much inclined to assume an earlier date. He gives no details but refers to the judgment of archbishop Norair Bogharian, "one of the great scholars of Armenian of the generation" who, in a conversation, "pointed to the absence from *Testament of Levi* of the stratum of Armenian vocabulary that entered the language as a result of the influence of the stylistic aberrations of the Philo-Hellene school of the late fifth and early sixth centuries."[51] We therefore have to allow for a translation made in the fifth century, but Stone remains cautious, aware of having to assume more than two transliterations in that case. He knows that this is extremely difficult to prove; but, he says, what cannot be demonstrated may for all that have taken place.

My conclusion is that we have to wait for unequivocal quotations from or allusions to the Testaments in the writings of early Armenain authors. With all due respect, it would seem to me that arguments on the strength of vocabulary or style are tenuous, because this kind of narrative and exhortative literature, in which moreover the sons of Jacob are purported to speak, has its own peculiar style and vocabulary.

In conclusion there is one other point deserving to be mentioned briefly. The Armenian version shows the tendency to shorten the text, even more so than the Greek manuscripts that have abbreviations. The textcritical rule *lectio brevior potior* certainly does not hold good for the Testaments, in any case not where divergencies of this kind are concerned. Needless to say that this means that even where we have to do with redacted Christian passages the shorter, less "Christian", Armenian text is not closer to the original.[52]

4. Are there traces of non-Christian transmission of the Testaments or of traditions incorporated in the Testaments?

4.1. Some remarks on Jubilees and Enoch

The discovery of small Hebrew fragments of Jubilees and Aramaic ones of Enoch in the caves near Qumran has deservedly attracted a lot of attention. The former writing had up to then been known in an Ethiopic version, a fragmentary Latin one (incidentally, from a

manuscript from the *sixth* century), Syriac fragments and Greek quotations—and all of a sudden much earlier, unmistakably Jewish fragments in Hebrew came at our disposal. For 1 Enoch we had to rely on an Ethiopic text, Greek quotations, (large) Greek fragments—and now, unexpectedly we were able to supplement them with undubitably Jewish Aramaic material. In both cases it was a matter of very small fragments, identified and often partly reconstructed by means of the existing versions.

With some caution because of the extremely limited range of material, James VanderKam concluded in 1977: "The text of Jub. which the Ethiopic manuscripts provide is very accurate and reliable. It reproduces the Hebrew text (*via* a Greek intermediate stage) literally and precisely in nearly all cases."[53] In the case of 1 Enoch the material is also restricted. According to the count made by M. A. Knibb,[54] the Aramaic material involves no more than 196 out of the 1062 verses of the Ethiopic Enoch, and in a great many cases only parts of these verses. In general there is agreement between the Aramaic and the Greek and Ethiopic, but sometimes the Aramaic gives a longer text, and there is also Aramaic material that cannot be connected with anything in the other versions. There are also other indications that the Enoch corpus of Qumran looked different from what is now in the Ethiopic version. As is well-known, Qumran has yielded as yet no fragments of the Parables of Enoch in 1 Enoch 37-71, and J. T. Milik has found fragments which he ascribed to a "Book of Giants" to which he assigned a place in the earliest form of the "Enochic Pentateuch".

In the case of Jubilees the Hebrew fragments may be used as a very valuable early textual witness for the reconstruction of the earliest attainable text of this writing. In the case of 1 Enoch the matter is considerably more difficult; there is, as it would seem, not necessarily merely one earliest attainable text.[55]

4.2 The situation with regard to the Testaments, in particular T. Levi

What is the situation with respect to the Testaments? Ever since finishing my dissertation I have kept myself abreast of new findings at Qumran, since I was continually cautioned that my theory of a Christian origin of the Testaments would be refuted the moment a fragment of the Testaments would surface at Qumran. In the over-confidence of youth I predicted, at the time, that this was extremely unlikely. In my

book I had after all already extensively discussed Aramaic Levi-fragments discovered in the famous Cairo Genizah, as well as a long Greek fragment in Ms. *e*, the eleventh century Ms. Koutloumous 39 (already mentioned) which corresponded with it. I had demonstrated that in the Greek Testament of Levi in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs we have to do with a thorough Christian redaction of a *Vorlage* related to the Aramaic and Greek material.[56] Indeed the fragments of Ar. Levi found at Qumran (as far as they have been published) partly correspond with the Aramaic fragments already known and partly run surprisingly parallel to a second addition in Ms. *e*. Furthermore, Milik announced in 1956 the forthcoming publication of a Hebrew fragment containing a genealogy of Bilhah in a form longer than that found in T.N. 1,6-12—a passage that is anyhow an excursus in that testament. So far only a small part of this fragment has been published.[57]

Twice in the recent past I have arranged and analysed all data known so far. Once in § 3 of the Introduction in the commentary on the Testaments by Hollander and myself,[58] and once in a contribution to the *Mémorial Jean Carmignac* entitled "The Testament of Levi and the 'Aramaic Levi' ".[59] In order to avoid burdening the reader with further details, I shall restrict myself in this paper to a broad outline, and to those conclusions that are relevant to our purpose.

a. The various Aramaic fragments (as regards content supplemented with the Greek ones) in the final analysis go back to only one writing. We can roughly estimate its content, probably approximately in the order now found in T. Levi. The beginning and the end are missing, and consequently we remain in the dark as to the literary genre of this presumed basic document.

b. We can, however, discern distinct parallels with the instructions from the person concerned to his son/sons, contained in 4Q Qahat and 4Q ʿAmram—and in the case of the latter clearly connected with the moment of his demise. Qahat appeals to his father Levi. It is therefore a matter of instructions (and prophecies) transmitted from generation to generation in priestly circles—and for that reason important for the Qumran sect. According to a number of scholars Ar. Levi would date from the third century B.C.

c. It is as yet not clear how the scribe of Ms. *e* could have laid hands on a Greek Levi-text corresponding with the Aramaic fragments and on various points more elaborate than these. The first insertion in *e* forms

a unity: it gives a prayer of Levi with a short introduction. It is, albeit somewhat awkwardly, inserted at the place in T. Levi that corresponds with that in the original context, as is shown by the new Aramaic fragment. The same goes for a small addition in T.L. 5,2. The third fragment has a distinct beginning, but breaks off abruptly in a biographic passage where the corresponding Aramaic fragment continues. In this case the Greek scribe probably had no complete text. He also inserted it at an awkward place, neither here nor earlier trying to really connect the passages in hand with the context into which he introduced them.

We are concerned here with an indubitably Jewish tradition in a Greek text that goes back to an Aramaic original. We are completely in the dark as to the writer and the date of translation, when it came into Christian hands and who transmitted it, in fragmentary form, together with the text of the Testaments but ultimately unconnected with them. It is, however, important to establish that the Greek translation can have been made and have circulated in Jewish circles at a relatively early date.

d. The Testament of Levi in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs is incontestably one of the twelve testaments, even though it differs considerably as regards its content. In my opinion this is due to the availability of such a vast quantity of interesting material from a Levi document very similar to the one underlying the Aramaic and Greek Levi fragments just mentioned. It may also have been known in Greek. However this may be, the extant document was abridged and drastically redacted; in my article in the *Mémorial Carmignac* I have, referring to earlier publications, attempted to demonstrate that "the present T. Levi is thoroughly Christian, but at the same time it acknowledges the special position of Levi and his tribe, the sacrificial cult (though it pays very little attention to it) and the Temple in Jerusalem in the time before the arrival of Jesus Christ" (p. 382).

e. It is interesting to note that the redactors of the Levi material also retained matters which, though perhaps of some interest to the readers, had lost their topicality. Thus T. Levi 9 gives a very short version of the rules for the priesthood passed on by Isaac to Levi, which in the fragments are represented in a very elaborate and detailed form. It is remarkable that not only a warning against πορνεία has been retained—which fits very well in the parenesis of the Testaments—but also the ban on marrying a Gentile woman; this is followed by a number of purification rules connected with sacrifices. The author mentions them since in

this case it concerns precepts for Levitical priests, in force in the time the narrative is said to have taken place and afterwards; the sons of Levi will exercise their function till the coming of Christ (T.L. 4,4; 5,2; 8,11-15; T.R. 6,8). However strong the emphasis in the parenesis is on these precepts and on the Law to be practised by all, Jews and non-Jews alike, there is none the less an awareness of those elements in the Old Testament which are specifically connected with Israel or with the priesthood, and from the chosen pseudepigraphical perspective these were taken into account.

The conclusion reached in this section is then: there are no traces of a non-Christian transmission of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. We can, however, establish that tradition material used in the Testaments had also been transmitted earlier in Jewish circles.

5. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs in the second century

5.1 The Testaments between the third and the eighth century

The first Christian author to quote the Testaments is Origen in his homilies on Joshua (transmitted in Latin only).[60] While not considering them canonical ("sed in aliquo quodam libello, qui appellatur testamentum duodecim patriarcharum, quamvis non habeatur in canone"), he yet thinks that they have sensible things to say. Referring to T. Reuben 2-3, he continues: "talem quendam invenimus sensum, quod per singulos peccantes singuli satanae intelligi debeant." Origen clearly attributes at least some authority to the Testaments. On the strength of this reference we have to consider the beginning of the third century as *terminus ad quem* for them. On the basis of parallels (to be discussed presently) with other authors from the last half of the second century and the beginning of the third (Justin, Irenaeus, Hippolytus), it is likely that they came into being at the end of the second century.

The reference in Origen is unmistakably vague as to the content of the passage involved; the same applies to that to T.N. 2,8 in Jerome, *Tractatus de Psalmo* 15.[61] These references give us no certainty as to the exact contents of the Testaments known to both authors. Are there possibilities to give a more specific picture of the developments between ca. 200 and ca. 700 (assuming that the present textual tradition in any case goes back to an eighth century archetype)?

One thing is certain: textual criticism leaves us in the lurch at this point. For instance: at the end of T. Dan 7 verse 3 is plainly a later addi-

tion. After the conclusion of the testament in 7,2 with the words "and his sons buried him, and afterwards they brought up his bones (to bury them) near Abraham, Isaac and Jacob", the text continues with the words: "But, as Dan prophesied to them, that they would forget the law of their God, and be alienated from the land of their inheritance and from the race of Israel and their family and offspring, so it came to pass." This is clearly a gloss, but all the same it is present in the entire manuscript tradition, and as to its contents not completely without parallel in the Testaments—witness T. Asher 7,6: "Therefore you will be scattered as Gad and Dan, my brothers, who will not know their lands and tribe and tongue." If we consider this verse as a later addition, we do so on the strength of the conviction that this verse does not fit in the composition pattern of the Testaments. We cannot ascertain when this gloss found its way into the text.

Can we identify more deviations from the composition pattern? Not, I think, with any certainty. The Testaments consist of farewell discourses, with a distinct beginning and a distinct end, devoted to the parenesis from the moribund patriarch to his children and grandchildren; they are illustrated with biographical material and end in prophecies concerning the future of the patriarchs' childeren and grandchildren. Occasionally we come across a great amount of haggadic material, as in the case of Levi—for which we have a parallel document—or in the case of Judah, where we find traditions about wars of Jacob's sons with the Canaanites, transmitted in Jubilees and elsewhere.[62] We may rightfully assume that the content of the Testaments was at their conception also determined by the tradition material available in written and/or oral form. But since we often cannot resort to external witnesses, we can at times only conjecture about the sources. In T. Joseph, for instance, which (just like T. Levi and T. Judah) is considerably longer than the other nine testaments, there are two cycles of stories, one about Joseph and Potiphar's wife (chs. 3-9) and one about Joseph's arrest and captivity (chapters 11-16). Both cycles have been made instrumental to the parenesis of the testament.[63] We do not know the origin of this haggadic material; nor whether its incorporation in the Testaments took place in one or more stages. Nor can we adduce any conclusive argument about *later* additions to the parenetic or biographical material to the Testaments in the time after Origen.[64]

5.2 The Christological passages

Will we, perhaps, be more successful if we turn to the eschatological/Christological passages? In view of the results of our analysis of the medieval transmission, it is obvious that we would have to look there for possible later additions. Transcribers will often have been unable to resist the temptation to dot the i's and cross the t's. The problem is, however, to prove they did so, and to date these additions.

In three recent publications[65] I have tried to demonstrate that in spite of everything there is considerable coherence and consistence in the pronouncements on the future, and on the role of Jesus Christ in that future. But at the same time we come across divergencies (in all the various types of passages about the future) and unexpected turns. May these, perhaps, be explained as commentaries or additions from different periods, before as well as after Origen? Do we have here indications that also the Testaments belong to what Robert Kraft has called "evolving literature"?[66]

While endorsing this in theory, we yet have to admit that in practice it actually gets us nowhere, since it is only with great caution that we are allowed to apply our modern criteria of consistency. We find, for instance, both "adoptianistic" and "patripassianistic" pronouncements in the Testaments. Thus in T. Levi 16,3 we read about "a man who renews the Law in the power of the Most High", whom the sons of Levi will call a deceiver (πλανός). T.L. 18,6-7 and T. Jud. 24,2 refer to the story of Jesus' baptism in the Jordan. But in T.L. 5,2 God announces that he himself is going to live in the midst of Israel, and 4,1 gives a description of the mighty things that are going to happen "at the suffering of the Most High". T. Jud. 22,2 mentions "the coming (παρουσία) of the God of righteousness", but shortly afterwards we read in 24,1 "and from my seed a man will arise like the sun of righteousness, walking with the sons of men in meekness and righteousness, and no sin whatever will be found in him."

It remains a moot question whether one is allowed to apply strict dogmatic standards to the Testaments such as have been refined in later theological debates. Implicitly referring to nineteenth-century discussions about the possibility of either a Jewish Christian origin of the Testaments or a gentile Christian one (a distinction very current at the time[67]), I concluded in my dissertation[68] (on the basis of these and many other examples) that the author could freely employ "adoptianistic"

and "patripassianistic" utterances because he was not aware of their one-sidednesses and liabilities. I also pointed out the great variety in Christology in the second century, when what later was to be called "heterodox" and "orthodox" could still occur side by side in the work of one author. "It must ... be borne in mind that in c. 200 A.D. the dogmatic controversy about the nature of Christ, and the attempts to create a well-defined Christological terminology, had only just started." Moreover, the Testaments were concerned with parenesis for a broad public rather than with Christology for connoisseurs; also the available oral and written tradition was of influence,[69] as were various Old Testament motifs. The exact terminology the patriarchs used was less important than the fact that they announced whom the church professed as its Lord and Master. Given this variety in Christology from the start, it is impossible to use Christological variants for tracing later additions (not to mention redactions) in the Testaments.

To bring this matter to a close: In view of the many references to Jesus Christ and the particular attention paid to Israel's response to him and to the way in which Israel could participate in the salvation brought about by him, we cannot but posit that to the author(s) of the Testaments the words of the patriarchs were important as an announcement of their own situation. Continuity in the history of salvation was assumed; the Jewish Scriptures were taken very seriously and concomitant traditions were readily adopted. Both, the writings of the Old Testament as well as the traditions connected with them, were interpreted in a Christian fashion.[70]

In order to situate the Testaments in the early church more precisely we shall have to pay special attention to the earliest forms of exegesis of Scripture. In this connection I have examined the work of the first commentator of the Bible whose writings are known to us, Hippolytus of Rome, and in particular his commentary on Genesis 49 and Deuteronomy 33.[71] This investigation did not result in a great amount of direct parallels—but it did (among other things) lead to the important insight that to Hippolytus and his readers Jesus was obviously to be connected with Levi as well as with Judah. And furthermore it became clear in the course of this study, with how great an inventiveness biblical data were interpreted in such a way that they could throw light on Christian ideas. Exegetical treatises like those of Hippolytus show early Christianity as a community reading and interpreting Scripture—often very much *ad hoc* and unsystematically.

It is an interesting point that the Testaments pay special attention to the relationship between Israel and Jesus as the redeemer of non-Jews and Jews. In the next section more will be said about this.

5.3 The function of the ethical exhortations in the Testaments within early Christianity

First and foremost, the Testaments give ethical instructions, to be followed by the descendants of the patriarch till the end of time. The ethics of the Testaments show influence of the Psalms and Wisdom books of the LXX, especially those only transmitted in the Greek Bible. The Cynic-Stoic philosophers offer many parallels. Only occasionally the best, or even only parallels are found in Christian sources. This has been shown convincingly by H. W. Hollander in his study on Joseph as a typical "good man" and as ethical model in the Testaments.[72] He consequently looked for the author in a circle of Wisdom teachers or in a Hellenistic-Jewish school. The ethical passages give little support to the thesis that the author was a *Christian* coming from a Hellenistic-Jewish circle.

In the chapter on "The Common Ethic" in his *Between Athens and Jerusalem*[73] J. J. Collins arrives at the same conclusion. "Ultimately the ethics of the Testaments cannot be pinpointed as the product of a specific situation. They are of interest for our purpose as material which seems to have accumulated and circulated in Hellenized Jewish circles over two hundred years and was eventually taken over by Christianity." Here and in other writings originating from the Diaspora, the specific and exclusively Jewish elements are pushed into the background, and current philosophical-ethical notions have been adapted to an overall Jewish religious scheme of reference. On this point we may compare *Gesetz und Paränese* by K.-W. Niebuhr,[74] in which he searches for "Katechismusartige Reihen für die Gesetzesparänese" and draws the conclusion that it is not only in the Testaments that we find a "geprägte paränetische Tradition des Frühjudentums", but also in Philo, *Hypothetica* 7,1-9, in Josephus, *Contra Apionem* 2, 190-219 and in Pseudo-Phocylides.

Personally, I have over the last few years learned to emphasize the fact that in the field of ethics there has been a considerable measure of continuity between Hellenized Judaism and certain circles in early Christianity.[75] All sorts of utterances in the Testaments are simply

Jewish as well as Christian, and totally acceptable to the non-Jewish and non-Christian Hellenistic fellow-citizens of the author(s) and readers of the Testaments.

I tried to show this in my essay "Rachel's Virtuous Behaviour in the Testament of Issachar" mentioned above.[76] Here I discussed the pronouncement in T. Iss. 2,1 on sexual continence (ἐγκρατεία), also within marriage, and the thesis in 2,3 that sexual intercourse ought to be practised with the purpose of begetting children rather than for the lust of pleasure (φιληδονία). There are interesting parallels here in statements of philosophers (e.g. Musonius Rufus and Seneca), of Josephus in his description of the Essenes in B.J. 2 §§ 119-166, of Philo (very numerous), and also in Christian sources from the second century, specifically in the Sentences of Sextus. Others, too, in particular Clement of Alexandria, offer a lot of material on this subject.

Particularly with regard to the ethics of the Testaments we do well to approach with utmost caution the thesis that what is not manifestly Christian stems from an earlier Jewish version of the Testaments. We are not free to regard the ethical pronouncements in the Testaments as expressions of an "open" type of Judaism from which early Christianity should have originated. The Testaments prove that there has been continuity between Hellenistic-Jewish and Christian parenesis; it is not impossible that also ethical pronouncements only received their present form at the final moulding of the Testaments in Christian circles.[77]

The continuity between the ethics of the patriarchs and that of the believers in the time after Jesus Christ is strikingly supported theologically, i.e. with respect to the history of salvation, in the words of early Christian thinkers like Justin, Irenaeus and Tertullian.[78] In the light of their statements on the faith of the patriarchs and their obedience to God in the time before Moses, and on the concentration on the Decalogue and the two great commandments as their summary after the coming of Christ, it becomes clear why exactly the parenetical testaments of Jacob's sons should become authoritative for Christians of the second century and later. The Testaments indicated what God's commandments really were and are about; then, in the days of Jacob's sons, and now in the time after Jesus Christ whose coming they predicted. In the time after the patriarchs Moses had been commissioned to issue extra commandments for the obstinate Jews, but these were only intended for Israel, and valid only for a restricted period. The

coming of Jesus Christ, as bringer of salvation for Jews and gentiles, had rendered them superfluous. The descendants of the patriarchs should give heed to this: they, too, should accept and obey this saviour and concentrate on the essential commandments.

At the end of the Testaments, in T. Benj. 10,4-10, we read how at the last judgment Enoch, Noah, Shem, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob will rise from the dead together with the twelve sons of Jacob, "worshipping the King of heaven appearing on earth in the form of a humble man". All people will rise and be judged according to their response to this saviour, gentiles as well as Israelites. But the sons of Benjamin should know:

> But you, if you walk in holiness before the face of the Lord,
> you will again dwell safely with me;
> and all Israel will be gathered together unto the Lord (v. 11).

In Justin, Dial. 45,4; 80-81; 130,1-2 we find a similar description. "We gentiles will rejoice with his people; I mean: along with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and the prophets, indeed of all that people who live agreeable to God" (130,2).

Viewed against the background of what has just been said, the function of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs in early Christianity becomes clear. They formulate how in the time after Jesus Christ God's commandments have to be obeyed, indeed what was God's intention throughout the history of salvation. For Israel, too, it is this obedience that really matters; this is the message contained in the summons by the fathers of the twelve tribes, who also announce the salvation in Christ to Israel. The author(s) of the Testaments was/were clearly anxious about the fate of Israel; he/they wanted to urge the Jews to accept the message of Jesus Christ and to let themselves be persuaded by it. To this end he/they strikingly chose the form of a parenetical tract rather than that of a polemic, apologetic or missionary writing. The Testaments cannot simply be classified as "Adversus Judaeos" literature[79]—which probably is a misnomer anyway. Likewise, the Gospel of Matthew and Justin's Dialogue with Trypho, mentioned by Graham N. Stanton in his article "Aspects of Early Christian-Jewish Polemic and Apologetic",[80] cannot (or only from a very one-sided point of view) be considered as writings levelled against the Jews.[81]

In conclusion I may point to the somewhat different assessment of the evidence by Georg Kretschmar in a recent essay.[82] He regards the

Testaments as a Christian composition from the second century, at a later stage more than once interpolated by Christians (an in itself plausible supposition, but very hard to prove, as I have argued above). Kretschmar classifies the Testaments among the "crypto-Christian writings". He emphasizes that they were composed in Christian circles which could formulate, and recognize, their convictions in texts attributed to authors of Old Testament times. In these parting words of the sons of Jacob the message concerning Christ was contained, not in an overtly missionary fashion, but hidden, in the form of allusions and promises, only really understandable for insiders. In Kretschmar's view the Testaments stem from Hellenistic-Jewish Christian circles that put much emphasis on the continuity in the history of salvation. The process of interpolation, assumed by Kretschmar, shows, according to him, that the Testaments were also used by communities of a different background, and remained authoritative for main stream Christians of later generations.

Continuing study of the so-called Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament by Christians remains necessary. It is likely to result in an increasingly differentiated picture of the relations between Jews and Christians belonging to various streams in Christianity in the second and third centuries—and probably also later, in the period after Constantine when Christianity took up a central position in the Roman Empire.

NOTES

[1] *NedTTs*39 (1985), 265-275; see n. 4.

[2] SVTP 8; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985. It is based on M. de Jonge *et alii, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (PVTG I,2; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978).

[3] Helmut Merklein (ed.), *Neues Testament und Ethik. Für Rudolf Schnackenburg* (Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 1989), 538-550; see n. 4.

[4] D. Balch *et alii* (eds.), *Greeks, Romans and Christians. Essays in Honor of A. J. Malherbe* (Minneapolis: Fortress and Augsburg, 1990), 340-352. The articles on the Testaments just mentioned have now been incorporated in M. de Jonge, *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Collected Essays* (NovTSup 63; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1991), 233-243; 277-289; 301-313 respectively.

[5] For details see the edition mentioned in n. 2.

[6] "La bibliothèque de Michel Choniatès et la tradition occidentale des Testaments des XII Patriarches" and "Additional notes on the history of MSS. Venice Bibl. Marc. Gr. 494 (*k*) and Cambridge Univ. Libr. Ff. 1.24 (*b*)" in M. de Jonge (ed.), *Studies on the*

Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (SVTP 3; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975), 97-106; 107-115.

[7] "Robert Grosseteste and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *JTS* N.S. 42 (1991), 115-125.

[8] Matthaeus Parisiensis, *Chronica Majora* (ed. H. R. Luard), IV, 232-233 and V, 284-287.

[9] For details see the article mentioned in n. 7, pp. 118-119.

[10] *Chron. Maj.* V, 285.

[11] "Testamenta duodecim Patriarcharum....quae per multa tempora incognita et abscondita fuerunt per invidiam Judaeorum, propter manifestas prophetias de Salvatore in eis contentas" (*Chron. Maj.* IV, 232).

[12] One has to assume translation from Hebrew into Greek if one starts from the thesis that the Testaments reproduce the words of Jacob's sons. Compare the introduction to the Testaments in Mt. Sinai, Monastery of St. Catherine, Cod. Gr. 547 (=770), ff. 1r.-70r., (s. XVII) = *h* and also in the codices *i* (no known number; ff. 1r.-38r.; s. XVII?) and *j* (Cod. Gr. 2170 [=608], ff. 8r.-88r; s. XVIII): Ἰωάννου τοῦ ποτε ἑβραίου εἴδησις τῶν διαθηκῶν τῶν ιβ′ υἱῶν τοῦ πατριάρχου Ἰακὼβ μεταφρασθεῖσα ἀπὸ ἰουδαικῶν διαλέκτου εἰς ἑλληνικήν. For further data see the Leiden *editio maior*, XIX-XXI. Cf. Oxford, Selden sup. ff. 232a-262a. from the fourteenth century, which does not mention Grosseteste's name. S. H. Thomson, *The Writings of Robert Grosseteste Bishop of Lincoln 1235-1253* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940), 43: "The rubric reads: secundum translationem Johannis Crisostomi de hebreo in grecum". See also the Middle Dutch manuscripts mentioned in n. 27.

[13] Thus Matthew Paris, *Chron. Maj.* IV, 233. The colophon speaks of the prophecies, which "in maiorem confusionem Iudaeorum et omnium haereticorum et inimicorum Ecclesiae gloriosius prorumpant."

[14] See on this H. J. de Jonge, "Les fragments marginaux dans le MS. *d* des Testaments des XII Patriarches," in M. de Jonge (ed.), *Studies on the Testaments*, 87-96.

[15] *Commentaria in Quattuor Libros Sententiarum* IV = *Opera Omnia* IV (ed. Quaracchi, 1899), Dist. XXIX, Qu. II, p. 703.

[16] On Bacon see H. J. de Jonge, "Die Patriarchentestamente von Roger Bacon bis Richard Simon (mit einem Namenregister)" in M. de Jonge (ed.), *Studies on the Testaments*, 3-42.

[17] *Opus Majus* (ed. J. H. Bridges), Suppl. Vol., 71-72.

[18] *Opus Majus* (ed. J. H. Bridges), Vol. II, 391.

[19] *Roberti Grosseteste Episcopi quondam Lincolniensis Epistolae* (ed. H. R. Luard), Epistola V (pp. 33-38). For further details see my article mentioned in n. 7, 71-72.

[20] Relatively many Mss. omit passages. In a number of cases it is a matter of copying errors, but generally speaking this is not so. The copyists did not go about in a systematic way; probably they simply thought the expositions of the Testaments too long-winded. In Ms. *g* (=Patmos, Mon. Joh. Theol. Ms. 411, ff. 178r-220v; saec. XV) which contains many abbreviations, the writer now and then vents his feelings. He leaves out two lists of spirits in T.R. 2,2-9; after the introduction to the first list in T.R. 2,1 about "what I saw about the seven spirits of deceit when I repented", he writes: ἀρκεῖ μοι εἰς διδασκαλίαν ὑμῶν. Comparable is the omission of a passage in T.N. 2,2-8 about the correlation between body and spirit, ending in 2,9 with the exhortation to abide by the order of creation. The scribe of *g* makes Naphtali declare καὶ ἐποίουν τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ (Jacob is meant) κατὰ τάξιν, and then adds καὶ ἕτερά τινα πολλὰ φυσιογνωμικά before continuing with an adapted version

of v. 9. According to *L.Sc.J.,s.v.* φυσιογνωμία is "the science or art of judging a man by his features". For details, here and elsewhere, see the Leiden edition of the Testaments mentioned in note 2.

[21] Except in Mss. *b* and *d*, to be discussed presently, also in *chij* (Cod. Vat. Gr. 731, ff. 97r-166v; saec. XIII; and the three manuscripts of the Monastery of St. Catherine on the Sinai, already mentioned).

[22] So, too, the copy of *l*, Athos Laura K 116 (cat. no. 1403). *d* has Παῦλος and *k* (see below) περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Παύλου.

[23] On *d* see H. J. de Jonge, "Les fragments marginaux dans le MS. *d* ..." (note 14).

[24] Annotation of H. J. de Jonge at the collation: "Glosses of—perhaps—the writer of the MS. himself." The handwriting is in any case related.

[25] For a great number of further details see H. J. de Jonge's article "Les fragments marginaux dans le MS. *d*."

[26] Only the introductions to T. Dan and T. Benjamin do not mention that the patriarch spoke περὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ. At T.D. 5,8 there is a marginal note εἰς βαβυλῶνα λέγει clearly written by the writer of the Ms., just as the interesting remark at T. Jud. 25,1 (speaking about the resurrection of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob along with Jacob's twelve sons): ὅτε ἀνέστη ὁ χριστὸς συναναστήσας αὐτούς. Of many more such additions it cannot be established that they stem from the writer himself. At the end of T. Benjamin the writer continues with a quotation from Gen. 49,17-18 LXX and a short commentary on this. In a different handwriting there is in the margin an addition περὶ τοῦ ἀντιχριστοῦ.

[27] Nijmegen, Gemeentearchief, Weeshuis Ms. 956, pp. 3a-50a; Ms. 957, pp. 3a-63a and Deventer, Athenaeumbibliotheek Ms. I,42 (101D6), f. 247r-v ("fragment, 2 blz. van de inleiding in 2 kolommen", see Catalogue 1892). See also Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, VJ 17, mentioned by Th. Mertens (see n. 29). The beginning in Ms. 957 (cf. 956) reads: "Here begin the testaments of the twelve patriarchs the children of the patriarch Jacob after the translation by St John Goldenmouth from the hebrew language into the greek language and from the greek language into the latin language and finally from the latin language into the dutch language ("Hier beginnen die testamente der xij patriarchen kinder Jacobs des patriarchen na oversettinge sancte Iohans guldenmoint van ebreuscher tongen in grixser tongen ende van grixser tongen in latijnscher tongen ende ten lesten van latijnscher tongen in duytscher talen"). For John Chrysosostom see also n. 12.

[28] "Hier eyndet die sermone ende die testamente der xij patriarchen Jacobs kinder des patriarchen die si maecten inden lesten eynde oers leuens daer si in seggen een deel van oren leuen mit menigerhande goeden exempel end leer die si oren kinderen leerden end beualen te doen"—see Louise Sormani, *Inventaris van de Archieven van het Borgerkinderen-Weeshuis, het Arme-kinder-Weeshuis en de beide Weeshuizen te Nijmegen* (Nijmegen, Drukkerij Gebr. Jansen, 1951), 302. Besides, (in Mss. 956 and 957) also in the introduction: ".. ende prophetierden hem toecomende dinghen, die naemaels gheschien solden, van oen ende van oren naecomelijnghe" (E.T.: ".. and prophesied things that would happen to them, things that afterwards were to happen, about the end of their progeny").

[29] Th. Mertens, "Geestelijke testamenten in de laatmiddeleeuwse Nederlanden. Een verkenning van het genre," in G. R. W. Dibbets and P. W. M. Wackers (eds.), *Wat duikers vent is dit! Opstellen voor W. M. H. Hummelen* (Wijhe: Uitg. Quarto, 1989), 75-89, points out that many spiritual testaments from the late Middle Ages are known, also in particular from the circles of the Modern Devotion. On pp. 86-88 he gives a list of them

(with on p. 86 a reference to Ms. Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek VJ 17 of the Testaments, according to H. J. de Jonge a copy of the printed edition from after 1540).

[30] See A. Welkenhuysen, "Plantijns drukken van de Testamenten der XII Patriarchen (1561, 1564, 1566) in hun 'boekhistorische' context", *De Gulden Passer* 66-67 (1988-1989), 505-515, see especially p. 509.

[31] A. Welkenhuysen, "Plantijns drukken", 514. Compare the article by I. M. Veldman and H. J. de Jonge mentioned in the next note, p. 179.

[32] "Die testamenten der XII patriarchen Jacobs kinderen, hoe een yeghelick voer sijnen eynde sijn kinderen gheleert totter vreesen Godts ende Godtsalighen leven vermaent heeft. Oock hoe een yeghelick bysonder doer den propheetschen ghyest van Christo den waeren Messia (claerder dan dat licht) gethuyghet. Daer inne veel schooner leer ende troesticker toeseggingen van Christo begrepen sint seer troestelick ende tot eenen waren Godtsalighen leven gants dienstelick." See I. M. Veldman and H. J. de Jonge, "The sons of Jacob: the twelve patriarchs in sixteenth-century Netherlandish prints and popular literature," *Simiolus* 15 (1985), 176-196, esp. p. 178, n. 10 and the picture on p. 186.

[33] Reproduced in facsimile by A. Welkenhuysen.

[34] "Die Textüberlieferung der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen", *ZNW* 63 (1972), 27-44 reprinted in *Studies* (n. 6), 45-62.

[35] "The Earliest Traceable Stage of the Textual Tradition of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", *Studies*, 63-86.

[36] See S. P. Brock on p. 3 in S. P. Brock and J.-C. Picard, *Testamentum Jobi/Apocalypsis Baruch Graece* (PVTG 2; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976).

[37] F. Schmidt, *Le Testament grec d'Abraham* (TSAJ 11; Tübingen: Mohr, 1986), 6-10; 17-26.

[38] Mentioned in M. Philonenko, *Le testament de Job* (Semitica 18; Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1968), 61-63; cf. F. Schmidt, 40. See also C. Römer and H. J. Thissen, "P. Köln Inv. nr. 3221: Das Testament des Hiob in koptischer Sprache. Ein Vorbericht" in M. A. Knibb and P. W. van der Horst (eds.) *Studies on the Testament of Job* (SNTSMS 66; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 33-45. B. Schaller, in his *Das Testament Hiobs* (JSHRZ III 3; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1979) made a first attempt to use the Coptic fragments textcritically. See also the "Introduction" by P. W. van der Horst and M. A. Knibb, in the volume just mentioned, especially p. 5: "The publication of this Sahidic version may indicate that a completely new edition of the Greek text will be required. It may turn out to be impossible to reconstruct an 'Urtext' because of the too great divergencies between the respective textual witnesses."

[39] "Zur armenischen Überlieferung der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen" in C. Burchard-J. Jervell-J. Thomas, *Studien zu den Testamenten der Zwölf Patriarchen* (BZNW 36; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1969), 1-29.

[40] "New Evidence for the Armenian Version of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", *RB* 84 (1977), 94-107, esp. p. 102. This article (as well as that mentioned in n. 48) can now be found in M. E. Stone, *Selected Studies in Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha with Special Reference to the Armenian Tradition* (SVTP 9; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1991), 131-144 (see esp. p. 139).

[41] S. Lazarro 346 (1220); Jerusalem 1925 (1269); Erevan 1500 (1282/3); Bodl. Arm. e 30 (s. XII)—see Burchard, pp. 13-14.

[42] See M. E. Stone, "Armenian Canon Lists III—the Lists of Mechitar of Ayrivank' (c. 1285 C.E.," *HTR* 69 (1976), 289-300 and "New evidence", 102, with the conclusion: "It

seems safer, therefore, to abandon the use of this list as a witness to the existence of the Armenian version of the Testaments in the eleventh century."

[43] See, for what follows, M. de Jonge, "The Greek Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Armenian Version", *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 120-139.

[44] See M. de Jonge, "Textual Criticism and the Analysis of the Composition of the Testament of Zebulun," *Studies*, 144-160.

[45] *Studies*, p. 138.

[46] Full title: A. Hultgård, *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches II. Composition de l'ouvrage. Textes et traductions* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Historia Religionum 7; Uppsala 1982). See my review in *JSJ* 14 (1983), 70-80.

[47] Crucial is his preference for the shorter text in T. Zebulun; the longer one is, in his opinion, secondary. For that reason for him the most important dividing line is not that between *bk* and the other groups, but that between *bk* and *gldm* on the one hand and *eafn-chij*SNgr and A on the other.

[48] "The *EPITOME* of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *Revue des Études Arméniennes*, N.S. 20 (1986-1987), 69-107; see also the volume mentioned in n. 40, 145-183. In it he announces a second article "The Epitome of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs in Matenadaran No. 2679," to appear in the *Proceedings of the International Conference on Mediaeval Armenian Literature* (Erevan).

[49] As has been demonstrated by Hultgård and Stone. See also M. E. Stone, "The Armenian Version of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Selections of Manuscripts", *Sion* 49 (1975), beside "New Evidence," mentioned in n. 40.

[50] "The *EPITOME*," 75 (151).

[51] "The *EPITOME*," 76 (152).

[52] I have amply demonstrated this in my dissertation *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Study of their Text. Composition and Origin* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1953; [2]1975), 23-24. I should also like to draw attention to an observation J. Jervell made in his "Ein Interpolator interpretiert. Zu der christlichen Bearbeitung der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen" (pp. 30-61 in the volume mentioned in n. 39). Jervell remarks that the Armenian version thoroughly modifies the pronouncements in the Testaments on the salvation of the nations and Israel. "Die armenische Übersetzung ist deshalb eine spätere christliche Übersetzung und Bearbeitung, für die das Verhältnis Israel und die Völker ohne Belang ist, für die die Testamente das Schicksal der Menschen überhaupt darstellen, m.a.W. Universalismus" (p. 40).

[53] James C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (HSM 14; Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1977), 94. See now also the introductions to his text and translation of Jubilees in *CSCO* 510-511 (Leuven: Peeters, 1989) and J. C. VanderKam and J. T. Milik, "The First Jubilees Manuscript from Qumran Cave 4: A Preliminary Publication," *JBL* 110 (1991), 243-270.

[54] M. A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Enoch. A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls* II (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 6-15. Knibb bases his judgment on the reconstruction of the texts in J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch, Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976).

[55] See M. A. Knibb in his review of M. Black (in consultation with James C. VanderKam), *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch. A New English Edition* (SVTP 7: Leiden E. J. Brill, 1985) in *JSJ* 17 (1986), 86-92, e.g. p. 92: "Black's translation is based not on the Ethiopic, nor on the Greek and Ethiopic, but on a combination of Ethiopic, Greek

and Aramaic. The Ethiopic and Greek represent essentially the same textual tradition, but it is questionable how far it is desirable to try to incorporate the Aramaic also in a single translation based primarily on the Ethiopic and the Greek in view of the fact that the Aramaic survives only in fragments, most of which are quite small, and that it often differs in minor, or even major, respects from the other witnesses."

[56] *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (see n. 52), 38-52.

[57] For details, see the publications mentioned in notes 58 and 59, in which it is also argued that a number of fragments of T. Judah and T. Joseph mentioned by J. T. Milik in his contribution "Écrits préesséniens de Qumrân: d'Hénoch à Amram" in M. Delcor (ed.), *Qumrân. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (BETL 46; Paris/Gembloux: Duculot/Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1978), 91-106, cannot be identified with certainty.

[58] *Commentary* (see n. 2), 17-29.

[59] F. García Martínez and É. Puech (eds.), *Mémorial Jean Carmignac. Études Qumrâniennes* (*R.d.Q.* 13; Paris: Gabalda, 1988), 367-385; see now my *Collected Essays* (n. 4), 244-262.

[60] *In Librum Jesu Nave Homiliae* 15,6 (ed. W. Baehrens, G.C.S., *Origenes VII 2*, Leipzig 1921).

[61] Ed. G. Morin, Anecdota Maredsolana III 3, Oxoniae 1903, now in C.C.L. 78, Turnhout 1958, p. 376: "In libro quoque Patriarcharum, licet inter apocryphos computetur, ita inveni: ut quomodo fel ad iracundiam, sic renes ad calliditatem et ad astutiam sint creati. Πανουργία autem id est calliditas...'. Cf. T.N. 2,8 ...χολὴν πρὸς πικρίαν ... νέφρους εἰς πανουργίαν.

[62] See on this e.g. H. W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *Commentary*, 26-27; 185-186 (also for further bibliographical data).

[63] As has been demonstrated in detail by H. W. Hollander, *Joseph as an Ethical Model in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (SVTP 6; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981), 16-49.

[64] Gradual growth of the Testaments is assumed (from a totally different perspective and with completely different results) but not, as far as I can see, proved by J. Becker, *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen* (AGJU 8; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970), and by A. Hultgård, *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches* I (Acta Univ. Upsaliensis, Hist. Religionum 6, Uppsala 1977). Hultgård, however, discerns two stages in the Christian additions—see the second volume of his *L'eschatologie* (mentioned in n. 46), 228-238. He mostly adduces textcritical arguments, in the framework of his totally different view on the textual history of the document.

[65] "The Future of Israel in the Testaments of the Twelve Patrarchs", *JSJ* 17 (1986), 196-211; "Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" in J. W. van Henten *et alii* (eds.), *Tradition and Re-interpretation in Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (FS J. C. H. Lebram; SPB 36; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1986), 150-162. Compare "Test. Benjamin 3:8 and the picture of Joseph as "a good and holy man" " in J. W. van Henten *et alii* (eds.), *Die Entstehung der jüdischen Martyrologie* (SPB 38; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1989), 204-214. See now my *Collected Essays*, 164-179; 191-203 and 290-300 respectively.

[66] See his "The multiform Jewish heritage of Early Christianity" in J. Neusner (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults* (FS Morton Smith; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975), III, 174-179, esp. 184-185.

[67] See the survey in H. Dixon Slingerland, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research* (SBLMS 21; Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1977), 8-15.

[68] *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (see note 52), 125-126; the following quotation can be found on p. 125.

[69] So also A. Hultgård; after having pointed out a number of parallels between Christological pronouncements in writings from the second century and those in the Testaments, he concludes: "Puis, comme le rédacteur chrétien développe ou refond un texte antérieur, il est légitime de supposer une influence de la terminologie du texte primitif. Le caractère différent de certains passages christologiques des *Testaments* peut ainsi être expliqué" (*L'eschatologie* II, 235).

[70] See on this H. W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *Commentary*, §8 "The Testaments in the early Christian Church" (pp. 67-82); M. de Jonge, "The Pre-Mosaic Servants of God in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and in the writings of Justin and Irenaeus", *VC* 39 (1985), 157-170 and "Hippolytus' 'Benedictions of Isaac, Jacob and Moses' and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", *Bijdragen* 46 (1985), 245-260. See now my *Collected Essays*, 263-376 and 204-219 respectively.

[71] See the article on Hippolytus mentioned in the preceding note and also "Two Interesting Interpretations of the Rending of the Temple-veil in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", *Bijdragen* 46 (1985), 350-362 (= *Collected Essays*, 220-232).

[72] See his *Joseph as an Ethical Model in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (see n. 63), "Conclusion" (pp. 93-97).

[73] J. J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem. Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (New York: Crossroad, 1983), 137-174. The quotation in the text is from p. 156.

[74] Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, *Gesetz und Paränese. Katechismusartige Weisungsreihen in der frühjüdischen Literatur* (WUNT II 28; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1987).

[75] As, of course, has been known all along to readers of the Epistle of James, the Shepherd of Hermas and other Christian writings such as the Sentences of Sextus.

[76] See n. 4. See also my earlier article "Testament Issachar als 'typisches' Testament", in *Studies*, 291-316, esp. 311-314.

[77] On this see also my essay "Die Paränese in den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und in den Testamenten der Zwölf Patriarchen", mentioned in n. 3.

[78] See my article "The Pre-Mosaic Servants of God in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Writings of Justin and Irenaeus", mentioned in n. 70; compare H. W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *Commentary*, §8.3 (pp. 71-76).

[79] See H. Schreckenberg, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld (1.-11.Jh.)* (Europ. Hochschulschriften 23, Bd. 172: Frankfurt a.M.-Bern-New York-Paris: Peter Lang, ^{2}1990).

[80] *NTS* 31 (1985), 377-392.

[81] On the Dialogue with Trypho, see "The Pre-Mosaic Servants of God", 165-166.

[82] "Die Kirche aus Juden und Heiden. Forschungsprobleme der ersten christlichen Jahrhunderte", in J. van Amersfoort and J. van Oort (eds.), *Juden und Christen in der Antike* (Kampen: Kok, 1990), 9-43, esp. 31-35. The author refers to an earlier article "Die Bedeutung der Liturgiegeschichte für die Frage nach der Kontinuität des Judenchristentums in nachapostolischer Zeit" in M. Simon (ed.), *Aspects du Judéochristianisme* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1965), 113-137, esp. 123-125 where he discusses T. Levi 8.

Vigiliae Christianae 47 (1993), 29-49, E.J. Brill, Leiden

DIOGENES THE CYNIC AMONG THE FOURTH CENTURY FATHERS

BY

DEREK KRUEGER

Basil of Caesarea, it seems, was quite fond of Diogenes the Cynic. In a casual note to a wealthy friend written around 358, Basil thanks his friend for gifts and jokingly protests that his beloved Poverty has been driven away. He muses that Poverty would object, since she had decided to live with Basil in the first place because he praised Zeno and Cleanthes and had donned the philosopher's cloak. "As for Diogenes," protests Poverty, "[Basil] has never ceased to admire him, who, endeavoring to be satisfied by the things derived from nature alone threw away even his drinking cup, after he learned from a boy how to bend over and drink from the hollow of his hands."[1]

As he appears here, Diogenes might be taken for just one of many elements of the literary culture which Late-Roman gentlemen shared and to which they might make witty reference. Basil's commitment to the traditions which transmitted this literary culture, articulated in his *Letter to Young Men on How They Might Benefit from Pagan Literature*, is evidence for a balance struck between Christianity and Greek παιδεία in Christian intellectual circles. Particularly interesting is the inclusion of Diogenes the Cynic philosopher in what Gregory of Nazianzus called "the roses among the thorns."[2]

The present study considers the attitudes of Christian writers in the second half of the fourth century toward traditions about Diogenes of Sinope, the Cynic philosopher. Cynicism in Late Antiquity has yet to receive serious attention, and while I do not attempt here to discuss the practice of Cynicism in Late Antiquity nor, in any detail, Cynic influences on Early Christianity, I hope to contribute to our understanding of the place of Cynic lore in Christian intellectual history.[3] Cynic ideas *are* found in the works of Early Christian authors. Cynic philosophical principles were absorbed into the Stoic tradition in the late-first and second centuries, and became largely indistinguishable from the Stoic

agenda. As Christians, in turn, absorbed Stoic modes of thought, elements of Cynic thinking became part of Christian philosophy.[4] For students of the history of Christianity, the study of Cynicism has contributed to an understanding of the reception of pagan literary genres such as the diatribe and the *chreia* by the authors of various writings in the New Testament.[5] Here we focus our attention on a later period.

The survival of Diogenes traditions in Late Antiquity

Charting the preservation of traditions about Diogenes in the school curriculum in Late Antiquity provides a background for surveying comments about Diogenes and Cynicism in the writings of fourth-century Christians. Then we can begin to understand what the figure of Diogenes meant to the architects of an emerging Christian intellectual culture. In exploring this question I have chosen to focus attention on Greek authors, since Diogenes and the Cynics remained a primarily Greek phenomenon.

Diogenes of Sinope lived in Athens during the fourth century BCE. According to the account given by Diogenes Laertius in his *Lives of the Philosophers*, the Cynic tradition started with Antisthenes, a student of Socrates. The movement gained notoriety with Antisthenes' disciple, Diogenes, an exile from Sinope, a city on the Black Sea coast of Asia Minor. Diogenes in turn was followed by Crates and Metrocles, Hipparchia and others. Although the colorful anecdotes reported about Diogenes of Sinope in the *Lives of the Philosophers* and other ancient writings are of little value for reconstructing the life of the historical Diogenes of Sinope,[6] the tradition tended to portray him walking the streets, dressed in a philosopher's robe, carrying a wallet and a staff. He upbraided passers-by for their hypocrisy, and from time to time he performed deeds considered shocking: eating in the market or at public lectures, farting loudly in crowded places, urinating, masturbating, and even defecating wherever he chose.[7]

By the time of the early empire, Diogenes had become a cultural type, what the Greek speakers would call a πρόσωπον, a recognizable stock character.[8] As such, he appears in works by a number of authors from the first and second centuries, including Dio Chrysostom, Epictetus, Plutarch, as well as in a collection of pseudepigraphical letters.[9] Each of these writers had access to a loosely organized body of traditions about Diogenes which circulated both in oral and in written forms.[10]

Familiarity with the figure of Diogenes did not fade away with the coming of Christianity. Sayings attributed to Diogenes and anecdotes about him were part of the cultural heritage of Late Antiquity, and these traditions were preserved (and even generated) particularly in the schools of grammar and rhetoric located in cities throughout the Mediterranean world.[11] Diogenes, as a cultural type, became a discrete element in Christian culture, an example from the past to be referred to in discussion of a range of topics, a bit of cultural property whose meaning and significance were widely debated. Christians' manipulation of Diogenes' meaning was part of their synthesis of the cultural legacy of the pagan past.

The chreiai *and the school tradition*

Major credit for the preservation of traditions about Diogenes in Late Antiquity must surely belong to the place of the *chreia* [χρεία] in the curriculum of the schools of rhetoric.[12] According to a textbook on rhetoric written by Theon of Alexandria in the second half of the first century, the *chreia* is "a concise statement or action which is attributed with aptness [εὐστοχία] to some specified character [πρόσωπον] or to something analogous to a character."[13] A *chreia* differs from a maxim [γνώμη] in that the chreia is attributed, while the maxim is anonymous. At an early point in a young man's rhetorical education (or perhaps late in his grammatical education),[14] his teacher introduced him to *chreiai* and taught him to perform a number of exercises on these sayings. For example, Theon prescribes that the student should practice reciting a *chreia*, should inflect the *chreia* in the various cases, and should comment on the *chreia*, raising objections where appropriate. The student then practiced expanding and condensing the *chreia*.[15] The eventual goal was to be able to use the *chreia* to compose an entire speech, or to use a *chreia* effectively in the course of a speech in order to illustrate a point.

Thus *chreiai* formed the building blocks of rhetorical education, and hence had direct bearing on the very art of speechmaking. At the teacher's disposal, preserved in a range of textbooks and anthologies, were literally thousands of sayings and anecdotes attributed or attributable to various ancient personages. Many *chreiai* were attributed to Socrates, Isocrates, and Menander. Perhaps the greatest number were attributed to Diogenes. Fischel has estimated that, in all their variations and permutations, the *chreiai* attributed to Diogenes number

more than a thousand.[16] In Theon's discussion of the *chreia*, seven of the twenty-nine *chreiai* which he uses as examples are attributed to Diogenes. Diogenes is also well represented in later textbooks.[17]

Chreiai attributed to Diogenes were also collected and transmitted independent of more general collections of *chreiai*. In the *Lives of the Philosophers*, Diogenes Laertius makes use of a number of earlier collections of *chreiai* specifically concerned with Diogenes of Sinope in compiling his anecdotal "life" of Diogenes.[18] Studies attempting to assess the authenticity of these and other sayings and deeds attributed to Diogenes are ultimately futile, since the whole point of the school exercise was to manipulate these statements and thus change them. There was little concern that the attributions should be accurate, only that they should be apt.

The requirement of apt attribution, however, suggests that the conception of a given character (πρόσωπον) was well developed and well understood. In order to attribute a saying to Diogenes, for instance, one first had to consider whether it was appropriate to his character. This character was based in large part on what had been attributed to Diogenes in other *chreiai*, the materials which formed a Diogenes tradition. *Chreiai* attributed to Diogenes shared a "family resemblance," in that they portrayed Diogenes as a certain sort of character. This character was determined by a set of loosely related "biographical" details which were commonly "known" to have happened in Diogenes' life, such as his exile from Sinope, his arrival in Athens, the fact that he carried a wallet and a staff and wore a white robe. Chief among the details were witty sayings, an ascetic way of life, and shameless acts.[19]

Early in the fifth century, the pagan John of Stobi compiled an anthology of passages from a wide range of Greek authors of poetry and prose.[20] This *chreia*-collection can help to illustrate how widespread traditions about Diogenes were in Late Antiquity. As Photius tells us, John presented "opinions, sayings, and maxims" as "precepts to discipline and improve his son."[21] The collection includes material from over 450 writers and was based on previous collections. John's anthology was copied frequently in the Byzantine world and has long served scholars because it preserves fragments of many texts now lost. *Chreiai* attibuted to Diogenes and brief stories about him make up a significant part of the collection; there are over sixty, making Diogenes one of the twenty most cited sources in the Anthology.[22] Reading through the Diogenes *chreiai* in the anthology can give us a sense of

what constituted the character of Diogenes in the fifth century. Here are some typical examples:

> When someone asked how can one become master of himself, Diogenes said, "When those things which he reproves in others he reproves even more in himself." (3.1.55)
>
> Diogenes mocked those who lock up their storehouses with bolts, keys and seals, but who open up all the doors and windows of their bodies, through their mouth, their genitals, their ears, and their eyes. (3.6.17)
>
> Diogenes said that virtue can reside neither in a wealthy city nor a wealthy house. (4.31c.88)

As is typical in the Diogenes *chreiai* as a whole, the Diogenes portrayed in John of Stobi's collection challenges hypocrisy and praises the virtue of poverty. He embodies the problem of living a moral life for the urban elite.

The *chreia* continued to be a feature of rhetorical education throughout Late Antiquity and, in fact, throughout the Byzantine era.[23] This means that those men educated in the art of public speaking throughout the period would have been familiar with the figure of Diogenes of Sinope. Furthermore, as these students became rhetors in their own right, they continued to employ the *chreiai* in their speeches. Thus, the rhetorical tradition assured that not only trained speech-makers, but also the larger segment of Late Antique society which constituted their audiences, were familiar with Diogenes and the meaning that his character came to embody.

I do not mean to suggest that the transmission of traditions about Diogenes in Late Antiquity was limited to his survival among educated elites. We must imagine that oral traditions contributed to the preservation and dissemination of anecdotes about Diogenes. Our only evidence for Diogenes in Late Antiquity, however, is literary and reflects the elite culture which produced it. Nevertheless, the transmission of so much material about Diogenes should be taken as evidence for his prominence in the literate culture and beyond.

Other sources for the preservation of Diogenes traditions

School exercises, of course, were not the only factor in the preservation of traditions about Diogenes in Late Antiquity. The writings of the Church Fathers, as well as the Emperor Julian and the Neo-Platonist

philosopher Damascius, give evidence for the existence of practicing Cynics in Late Antiquity. Although Donald Dudley's *History of Cynicism* devotes only seven pages to the period from the third to the sixth centuries, the evidence suggests that practicing Cynics continued to be a feature of urban life until the decades immediately preceding the reign of Justinian.[24] Some of the Cynics are known to us by name. We hear of Heracleius, a Cynic whom Julian attacked for misrepresenting the gods in his speeches.[25] In the writings of Patriarch Gregory of Nazianzus, we hear also of Maximus, a Christian priest from Alexandria, who also identified himself as a Cynic, who arrived in Constantinople in 380.[26] Damascius' *Life of Isidorus* gives a spare account of a Cynic and Neo-Platonic philosopher named Sallustius who was born around 430 and seems to have survived into the early decades of the sixth century.[27] In addition to those whose names we know, sources from the period either address or refer to groups of nameless practitioners of Cynicism. Julian composed a speech scolding the Cynics of his day for failing to understand Diogenes and achieve his objectives.[28] Augustine was also aware of the continued existence of Cynics.[29]

It is not easy to account for the continuity in the Cynic tradition, such that into the sixth century, citizens of Alexandria and other cities might be witness to a critique of common social values similar to those of an earlier age. At no time did the Cynics have anything even resembling a school. Individual Cynics seem to have operated as loners, and with the exception of Agathobulus who, according to Lucian, taught both Peregrinus and Demonax in Egypt during the second century, there is little evidence that "established" Cynics took on students.[30] Nevertheless the Cynic way of life continued to have a powerful appeal for some; "the army of the dog" continued to attract recruits. Asmus' study of Sallustius demonstrates that this particular Cynic had much in common with earlier Cynics, especially Peregrinus and Diogenes.[31] While such a continuity might have been perpetuated by each would-be Cynic observing the behavior of another, we cannot rule out the possibility that the continuity was the result of exposure to the traditions about Diogenes himself, through the circulation of stories about the man from Sinope in either oral or literary forms. Again we must turn to the influence of the rhetorical schools and the place of the *chreiai* attributed to Diogenes in the speeches and popular literature of the day. As long as the character of Diogenes was familiar, it continued to present a model for how a Cynic might behave. The practitioners of

Cynicism were involved in an "imitation of Diogenes," not unlike some Christian ascetics' "imitation of Christ."

Attitudes toward Diogenes in the fourth century

The fourth century brought changes in the status of Christianity in aristocratic and, hence, in intellectual circles. The relationship between Christianity and traditions of pagan learning were renegotiated, and the figure of Diogenes was revalued in the process.

Basil of Caesarea

Basil's formulation of the balance between Christian values and pagan culture had crucial consequences for the whole of Christian intellectual history in the East. With Basil, Diogenes became firmly rooted in a Christian intellectual tradition. Basil's *Letter to Young Men on How They Might Benefit from Pagan Literature* had tremendous influence in Late Antiquity and in Byzantine times. The letter was addressed to Basil's nephews, and it is unclear whether Basil intended it for wide circulation. Numerous manuscripts survive from the late ninth century on, by which time it had become widely used as a school text. The existence of Syriac translations of the text, a first from the fifth century and a second from the seventh,[32] suggest that Basil's letter was widely read. Thus the letter not only reflected, but also served to shape a Christian philosophy of education, establishing the outlines of a Christian curriculum which differed little from that of the Late Antique pagan schools.[33]

Basil believed that a school-boy's reading should instill a sense of virtue. Although Basil felt that "we [Christians] will learn these things more perfectly from our own literature,"[34] he still argued for the value of non-Christian texts which had provided material for the training of young men since Hellenistic times, as long as the Christian student distinguished what was useful in pagan literature from what was harmful. Basil felt that one could disregard the latter and receive instruction from the wisdom of the former.[35]

In Basil's letter on pagan literature, among references to Homer and Hesiod, Plato and Plutarch, are passages based on *chreiai* attributed to Diogenes of Sinope. Diogenes pointed to a form of behavior which Basil felt was desirable for Christian youths. Basil writes,

> [T]o spend one's time, beyond what is necessary, on the care of the hair or on dress, is, according to the saying of Diogenes, the mark of men who are either unfortunate or doing wrong.[36] Hence, to be a dandy and get the name of being one ought, I maintain, to be considered by persons so inclined just as disgraceful as to keep company with harlots or to seduce other men's wives. For what difference should it make, at least to a man of sense, whether he is clothed in a costly robe or wears a cheap workman's cloak, so long as what he has on gives adequate protection against the cold of winter and the heat of summer?[37]

And later,

> I admire also the scorn of Diogenes for all human good without exception, who declared himself richer than the Great King [Alexander the Great] by reason of the fact that he needed less for living than the King.[38]

Basil felt that the example of Diogenes which was presented in the educational curriculum was instructive and worthy of inclusion in the canon of information to be passed on to Christian students. Diogenes was good for the care of the soul because it was possible to illustrate appropriate Christian behavior from the example of Diogenes. Furthermore, Basil's inclusion of Diogenes in this letter assured that Diogenes would remain in the curriculum.

The Emperor Julian

The pagan tradition, of course, was not static in this era, and the meaning of the figure of Diogenes was debated by pagans as well as Christians. There is no better evidence of the pagan concern to revalue the legacy of the Cynic tradition in this era than the writings of the emperor Julian. Julian's oration directed against "uneducated Cynics" was probably composed in Constantinople, late in the spring of 362, shortly before his departure for Antioch and the preparations for his Persian campaign.[39] In this speech Julian defended Diogenes from criticisms which had been directed against him by contemporary Cynics, especially that Diogenes was foolish when he ingested raw octopus. Julian defended this deed, as well as many of Diogenes' acts of shamelessness, by arguing that Diogenes' intent was to determine which activities humans engaged in on account of nature, and which they engaged in merely to conform with social convention (δόξα).[40] Julian presents Diogenes as a model against which to judge contemporary Cynics and in fact all philosophers. For Julian, Diogenes is the ideal

pagan philosophical type, and Diogenes' shameless acts are an essential and even laudable aspect of his character. Although Julian states he is responding to Cynic allegations against Diogenes in this oration, criticism was also leveled at Diogenes by Christians, and Julian seems to have taken on the defense of a pagan philosophical type in order to present Diogenes as an alternative to Christian asceticism.

Shortly after he composed this oration against the "uneducated Cynics," Julian spent time in residence at Antioch. When Julian's remarks about Diogenes are read against the comments of John Chrysostom, a monk and later presbyter at Antioch, we can see that the value of Diogenes as a model for moral behavior was part of the larger debate between pagans and Christians in the second half of the fourth century over which community was the legitimate heir of Greco-Roman educational and philosophical traditions.

John Chrysostom

John Chrystostom received his rhetorical training in Antioch in the age of the great pagan orator Libanius. Chrysostom was educated widely in classical authors. Although his writings have led one modern critic to suggest that he "retained little admiration" for the poets and philosophers he had read in the pagan curriculum, Chrysostom clearly remembered these works and would refer to them in his own writings to make a point.[41] Certainly Chrysostom was not indifferent to all aspects of Greek philosophy, for while he was concerned to show that Greek philosophers compared badly with Christian thinkers, he was quick to cite the achievements of individual philosophers who had led lives which, at least in part, could be regarded as exemplary. Diogenes the Cynic received both Chrysostom's criticism and his praise.

In his treatise *Against the Enemies of the Monastic Life*, John Chrysostom praises the ascetic virtues of some pagan philosophers, including Socrates and Plato. As for Diogenes, he writes,

> Do you know how much money Alexander [the Great] would have given to Diogenes, if he wanted to accept it? But he did not want it. And Alexander tried hard and did everything, so that he might some day come to Diogenes' riches.[42]

And again, "that other philosopher, the one from Sinope, was richer by far than these and countless other such kings."[43] Chrysostom invokes Diogenes as an exemplar of the ascetic life, as a case relevant

to the defense of Christian monasticism. Chrysostom assumes that his audience is familiar with the story of Diogenes and Alexander, and that it was already inclined to think well of Diogenes.[44]

Chrysostom's invocation of Diogenes in defense of monasticism needs to be considered in light of the considerable suspicion against asceticism among Christian elites.[45] The decision to adopt the monastic life was seen as a radical break with the privileges and duties of the life of the upper classes throughout the Mediterranean world. Parents in particular resisted their children's impulses to retire from the world. Rather than rejecting a pagan model for asceticism out of hand, Chrysostom used Diogenes as a justification for Christian ascetic behavior. Chrysostom argued that if Diogenes was respected by educated Christians for his way of life, despite the fact that he was a pagan, how much more should the Christian ascetic be worthy of respect.

All the same, Chrysostom could be staunchly critical of the pagan philosophers. In his *Discourse on the Blessed Babylas*, composed in Antioch around 378, Chrysostom compares the murdered bishop of Antioch to ancient philosophers. Of course, Babylas is superior to these men. Chrysostom accuses the pagan philosophers of "vain-glory, impudence, and puerility," and praises Babylas because "he did not shut himself up in a large wine cask, nor did he go round the market place clothed in rags." The reference, of course, is to Diogenes.[46] Chrysostom chides Diogenes for his audacity in asking Alexander the Great to step out of his light. When Chrysostom's imaginary interlocutor protests that " 'the man from Sinope was also temperate and lived abstinently, even refusing to contract a legitimate marriage,' " Chrysostom responds,

> But add how and in what way! You will not add it, but prefer to deprive him of praise for temperance than tell the mode of his temperance, so foul and full of so much shame.[47]

The reference here is most likely to stories about Diogenes' tendency to masturbate in public.[48] After condemning the approving attitudes of Aristotle, Chrysippus, Socrates, and Plato toward various sex acts, Chrysostom accuses Diogenes of being indifferent to cannibalism. Chrysostom presents Diogenes as licentious and morally irresponsible, hardly worthy of comparison with a Christian saint. What is most intriguing is that Chrysostom's argument procedes by countering a posi-

tion which he assumes to be commonplace: that Diogenes' way of life, his poverty, freedom, and temperance were laudable.

The speech in praise of the martyr Babylas is directed "against Julian and against the pagans." It is probable that Chrysostom was familiar with Julian's oration against the "uneducated Cynics." Julian argued that Diogenes had rejected common opinion in favor of a life according to the principles of nature, a standard interpretation of Diogenes' behavior found already in the pseudepigraphic epistles.[49] But the Greek word, δόξα, which Julian and the epistles use to mean "social convention" or "opinion," also means "glory" or "honor," a concept related to renown or repute.[50] For Chrysostom, glory was for God alone and was to be rejected by the saints. Chrysostom's letter to a young widow argues that a number of ancient philosophers rejected wealth in pursuit of "glory from everyone" [τῆς δόξης τῆς παρὰ τῶν πολλῶν], that is, public recognition or common good opinion. It is precisely the virtue of the *rejection* of δόξα which Chrysostom wishes to instill in the widow.[51] In arguing here that Diogenes sought δόξα, Chrysostom contradicts the commonplace assertion found in Julian that he did not. For Chrysostom, the notion that Diogenes had been motivated by δόξα was sufficient grounds to condemn him. In a homily on First Corinthians, Chrysostom says that the apostles did not seek glory,

> Not like him of Sinope, who clothed in rags and living in a cask to no good end, astonished many, but profited none: whereas Paul did none of these things; (for neither had he an eye to ostentation;) but was both clothed in ordinary apparel with all decency, and lived in a house continually, and displayed all exactness in the practice of all other virtue; which the Cynic despised, living impurely and publicly disgracing himself, and dragged away by his mad passion for glory [δόξα]. For if any one asks the reason of his living in a cask, he will find no other but vain-glory alone.[52]

When John Chrysostom compared Cynics and Christians, the Cynics were to be faulted for their failure to achieve the virtues of early Christians. Chrysostom is thus refuting a *contemporary* pagan evaluation of Diogenes and the meaning of the Cynic tradition in order to prove the superiority of Christianity. In fact, Chrysostom is specifically interested in discrediting this pagan exemplar who most seems to embody Christian ideals.

Gregory of Nazianzus

John Chrysostom's rejection of Diogenes as unworthy of a Christian's praise stands in great contrast to the opinions of a man who preceded him as patriarch of Constantinople, Gregory of Nazianzus. In

a letter composed after he had been removed from the patriarchate and returned to his home town, Gregory addressed the civic administrators of Nazianzus, seeking to obtain a tax exemption for a local priest.

> It seems to me that you would not spare Diogenes of Sinope's wallet, if it were up to you, rather if you could lay your hand on it also, and regard his cloak, staff, and his lack of all possessions on account of his philosophy as a profession, his habit of going from door to door, living life however it comes...[then you would also tax this poor priest who serves the community.][53]

Diogenes here, as we have seen elsewhere, is a paradigm for a person living in voluntary poverty for the sake of others. Such a person is worthy of regard by civil officials and therefore by the town in general. Gregory's reference to Diogenes has much in common with that in the personal letter of Basil's quoted above. Diogenes was part of these gentlemen's culture, and Gregory's opinion of Diogenes was not unlike that of his friend and fellow Cappadocian. This similarity is all the more remarkable given Gregory's previous experiences with a flesh and blood Cynic.

In 380 a certain Maximus arrived in Constantinople from Alexandria. Before his conversion to Christianity, Gregory explains, Maximus had practiced Cynicism. When he arrived in Constantinople he still had long hair and carried a staff.[54] It is clear from his garb as well as from Gregory's description that, although Maximus had become a Christian, he remained in some sense a Cynic. The Nicene bishop of Constantinople, soon to be patriarch, Gregory of Nazianzus preached two panegyrics in his honor referring to him as a "philosopher."[55] These two orations in honor of Maximus are, in fact, a defense and praise of philosophy, albeit a conditional one. These neglected speeches are exceptionally good evidence for a late fourth-century synthesis of pagan learning and Christian culture, a synthesis which the Cappadocians played a leading role in creating. Gregory's treatment of philosophy was far more positive than anything that would be found in John Chrysostom. Gregory refers to philosophers in general as "witnesses [μαρτύρες] to the truth."[56] He continues, "Their splendid robes are angelic as is the radiance which they express in outward form in their bodies."[57] The language here recalls that used of Christian monastics (and late-Neoplatonist pagan philosophers). This speech was given when, of all philosophical types, a Cynic was on hand. Gregory was not just referring to the martyred Socrates. In Gregory's eyes the aims of

Maximus' philosophy and his Christianity were compatible. For Gregory, this Cynic Christian was a "defender of the truth and a champion of the Trinity,"[58] worthy of comparison with the martyrs. Gregory refers to Maximus many times as a "dog," punning on the commonly accepted etymology for the word "Cynic" (κυνικός, which can also mean "dog-like"),[59] and says that he is a

> ...dog [κύων], not by shamelessness, but by courage [παρρησία], nor by gluttony, but by living day by day, nor by barking [ὑλακή], but by guarding [φυλακή] the good and keeping watch over souls, and by wagging your tail at whatever belongs to the family of virtue and barking at whatever does not.[60]

The connection between Cynics and dogs is exploited most fully in praising the philosopher. Even in this high praise, however, we can see another vision of the Cynics, one characterized by accusations of shamelessness and gluttony. Apparently the criticisms which we saw in Chrysostom were not uncommon. Maximus had, Gregory tells us, risen above the peculiar practices of his pagan predecessors—Antisthenes' arrogance, Diogenes' vegetarianism, and Crates' fondness for group marriage—and was quite different from them in his prudence, continence, modesty, affability, sense of community, and love of humanity.[61]

Gregory's affection for Maximus did not last long. A few months after Maximus arrived in Constantinople, he attempted to unseat the bishop and have himself installed in Gregory's place. He bribed a priest who was a member of Gregory's staff to help him and gained the support of a mob of sailors from the Alexandrian fleet, recently moored at Constantinople. His plan failed, thanks to loyal citizens who interrupted Maximus' sham consecration ceremony. Gregory was understandably furious, and not long after, when he had resigned his post and retired to his native Cappadocia, he expressed his wrath in his autobiographical poem, *De vita sua*, devoting a quarter of the work to this incident.[62] Explaining his error in praising Maximus earlier, Gregory writes, "It was a great thing for me when a dog tread in my court-yard and worshipped Christ instead of Herakles."[63] But Gregory only condemned the man, not his philosophy. Concluding his narration of this episode he says,

> Such is the philosophy of our modern dogs: barking dogs, and dogs in this alone. In what way are they like Diogenes or Antisthenes? What has Crates to do with you?[64]

Gregory echoes Julian in rejecting the Cynics of his own day because they did not live up to the examples of the great Cynics of the past.

In his later years, when he spent much of his time composing poetry, Gregory continued to hold that Christians could learn from virtuous non-believers, "like gathering roses from among the thorns."[65] In this way, he continued to make reference to the example of Diogenes.

> Who has not heard of the Sinopean dog? What else needs be said but that he was someone thus, simple and moderate in life, and giving these laws to himself, not observing laws from God, and not on account of any hope, so that he had one possession, his staff, an open-air house in the middle of the town, a round barrel, an escape from the force of the wind, which for him was better than dwellings laden with gold, and food near-by, not prepared with toil.[66]

For the retired patriarch, Diogenes' life remained a romanticized ideal. Despite Gregory's troubles with his Cynic contemporary, Diogenes continued to be proverbial for his virtuous poverty.[67] His obvious shortcoming was that he was not motivated by the love of God.

Conclusions

The writings of Basil and Gregory should not be taken as evidence that all educated Christians of the Later Roman Empire were enthusiastic about Diogenes of Sinope. An example of the ambivalance with which a Christian student of the Greek philosophical tradition might regard the man from Sinope can be seen in Theodoret of Cyrrhus' monumental treatise *The Cure of Pagan Maladies*, the last of the great Christian anti-pagan apologies. The work dates from the second quarter of the fifth century;[68] it is appropriately subtitled *The Truth of the Gospels Proved from Greek Philosophy*. Canivet has shown that Theodoret is greatly dependent on Clement of Alexandria's *Stromata* and Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica*. Theodoret's writings show a high degree of the Greek learning so widely exploited by Christians, and the range of figures on which he draws is remarkable. In this, Diogenes is no exception. Theodoret refers to Diogenes of Sinope six times in the course of the treatise.[69] Theodoret regarded Diogenes as "a slave to pleasure." "He mingled with prostitutes in public, and he set a bad example for those who saw him." Diogenes "lived lewdly, without restraint."[70] Theodoret remembers that Crates had surrendered to passion and "consummated his dog-marriage [κυνογαμία] in public."[71] For

Theodoret, the Cynics were examples who prove the rule that "the road to virtue is rough, steep, and difficult."[72] What is more, Antisthenes, Diogenes, and Crates lived as they did for the sake of glory (ἕνεκα δόξης) in sharp contrast to the Christian "athletes of virtue."[73] Diogenes, it seems, missed the mark, and was therefore an inappropriate model for the Christian seeking to live the moral life. Such an argument, however, presupposes what we have already seen in Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus, namely that many Christians were inclined toward Diogenes as a model of virtue. In fact, in his *Discourse on Providence*, written for an Antiochene audience sometime after 435, Theodoret lists Socrates, Diogenes, and Anaxarchus as examples of people who renounced wealth in favor of poverty.[74]

Theodoret's views on Diogenes and Cynicism were not unlike those of John Chrysostom, his predecessor in the Antiochene intellectual tradition, and demonstrate that neither did Christians share a unified stance toward Diogenes, nor was the position of any particular Christian toward Diogenes entirely consistent. Ultimately Diogenes' shamelessness was the stumbling block for a number of Christians. In this regard it is worth citing the opinions of one Latin author, Augustine of Hippo, who argued in *City of God* that Diogenes behaved shamelessly

> because he imagined that his school of philosophy would gain more publicity if its indecency were more startlingly impressed on the memory of mankind.[75]

Augustine, however, claimed that this practice was not continued when modesty prevailed over the mistaken notion that "men should make it their ambition to resemble dogs." He continues,

> Hence I am inclined to think that even Diogenes himself, and the others about whom this story is told, merely went through the motions of lying together before the eyes of men who had no means of knowing what was really going on under the philosopher's cloak.

Rather unimaginative indeed is Augustine's remark, "I doubt whether the pleasure of that act could have been successfully achieved with spectators crowding round." In what I believe is an otherwise unattested twist on the ancient *chreiai*, Augustine was willing not only to defend the Cynic's shameless behavior, but to go so far as to deny it by claiming that Diogenes was only pretending to do something unseemly. We can only wonder whether this attempt to vindicate Diogenes was persuasive.

For Augustine, the Cynic's achievements were too important to allow them to be discredited by lewd stories.[76]

On the basis of the evidence examined here, we can make the general observation that Late Ancient Christians cited Diogenes positively to support their arguments in favor of the life of poverty and self-control, and negatively to argue against surrendering to passion and lust. However, Christian lack of consistency with regard to Diogenes should not be surprising. Christians presented a varied picture of Diogenes because they had received a varied picture. The πρόσωπον of Diogenes was a composite of asceticism and shamelessness. The variety of ways in which Christians employed the *chreiai* attributed to Diogenes reflected the diversity within the figure of Diogenes which the *chreiai* preserved.

NOTES

[1] Basil, *Ep.* 4, LCL. Except where noted, translations are my own. Variants of this *chreia* include Plutarch, *Mor.* 79e; D.L. 6.37; *Ep. Diog.* 6.

[2] Greg. Naz. Poem 1.2.10, ll.215-16; PG 37, 696.

[3] Rudolf Asmus, "Der Kyniker Sallustius bei Damascius," *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur* 25 (1910) 504-522, remains an important study. On the history of Cynicism in general see Donald R. Dudley, *A History of Cynicism from Diogenes to the Sixth Century A.D.* (London, 1937). Léonce Paquet, *Les Cyniques Grecs* (Ottawa, 1975) collects anecdotes relating to each major Cynic. An overview of Cynic thought and ways of life can be found in Ferrand Sayre, *Greek Cynicism and the Sources of Cynicism* (Baltimore, 1948); and Heinrich Niehues-Pröbsting, *Der Kynismus des Diogenes und der Begriff des Zynismus* (Munich, 1979). Studies of individual topics include Ragnar Höistad, *Cynic Hero and Cynic King* (Lund, 1948); Harrold Attridge, *First Century Cynicism in the Epistles of Heraclitus* (Missoula, Montana, 1976); I. Nachov, "Der Mensch in der Philosophie der Kyniker," in *Der Mensch als Mass der Dinge*, ed. R. Müller, (Berlin, 1976), pp. 361-98; Abraham Malherbe, "Self-Definition among Epicureans and Cynics," in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, vol. 3 (*Self-Definition in the Greco-Roman World*), ed. B.F. Meyer and E.P. Sanders, (Philadelphia, 1983) pp. 46-59; Jean-Marie Meilland, "L'Anti-intellectualisme de Diogène le Cynique," *RevThPh* 115 (1983) 233-246; Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé, *L'Ascèse Cynique: Un commentaire de Diogène Laërce VI: 70-71* (Paris, 1986); Margarethe Billerbeck, *Epiktet, Vom Kynismus*, Philosophia Antiqua 34 (Leiden, 1978).

[4] On Stoic influences on Christian writers see Michel Spanneut, *Le Stoïcisme des pères de l'église: de Clément de Rome à Clément d'Alexandrie*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1969); and *Permanence du Stoïcisme: de Zénon à Malraux* (Gembloux, Belgium, 1973). For an emphasis on the Latin tradition see Marcia L. Colish, *The Stoic Traditions from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages: I. Stoicism in Classical Latin Literature* (Leiden, 1985). Neither author deals seriously with Cynicism. Colish recognizes that Stoicism was influenced by Cynicism and mentions Stoic borrowings of Cynic sexual ethics and attitudes concerning appearance (pp. 8, 37-38, and 200). It is a curiosity worth noting that Colish refers to

Diogenes as "Diogenes the Stoic" (p. 103) and describes him later as "the Cynic-Stoic saint" (p. 182).

[5] The classic study is Rudolf Bultmann, *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe* (Göttingen, 1910). More recently there is Abraham Malherbe's work on Paul: " 'Gentle as a Nurse': The Cynic Background to 1 Thess 2," *NovTest* 12 (1970) 203-217; "Antisthenes and Odysseus, and Paul at War," *HTR* 76 (1983) 143-173; "Exhortation in First Thessalonians," *NovTest* 25 (1983) 238-256; " 'In Season and Out of Season' 2 Timothy 4:2," *JBL* 103 (1984) 235-243; *Paul and the Thessalonians* (Philadelphia, 1987); and *Paul and the Popular Philosophers* (Minneapolis, 1989). F. Gerald Downing has addressed questions of Cynic influence on the Gospels; see his "Cynics and Christians," *NTSt* 30 (1984) 584-593; "The Social Contexts of Jesus the Teacher: Construction or Reconstruction," *NTSt* 33 (1987) 439-451; "Quite like Q: A Genre for 'Q': The Lives of the Cynic Philosophers," *Biblica* 69 (1988) 196-225; "A Bas Les Aristos: The Relevance of Higher Literature for the Understanding of the Earliest Christian Writings," *NovTest* 30 (1988) 212-230; "Compositional Conventions and the Synoptic Problem," *JBL* 107 (1988) 68-85; *Christ and the Cynics* (Sheffield, 1988). See also J.S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q* (Philadelpia, 1987), pp. 306-325; and Burton Mack, *The Myth of Innocence* (Phildelphia, 1988), pp. 67-9. For a consideration of post-New Testament Christian attitudes toward Cynicism before the fourth century, see my forthcoming article "Diogenes, the Cynics, and the Christian Apologists," and my "Cynics, Christians, and Holy Fools: The Late Antique Contexts of Leontius of Neapolis' *Life of Symeon the Fool*," Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University, 1991, pp. 116-137.

[6] Dudley still found it possible to discuss Diogenes as a historical figure whose actions had specific content, although he realized that anecdotes and teachings attributed to Diogenes by Epictetus, Dio Chrysostom and Julian were of little value in the attempt to reconstruct the origins of Cynicism (*A History of Cynicism*, p. 20).

[7] Eating in public: D.L. 6.57, 58 and 61. Farting: D.L. 6.48; cf. D.L. 6.94; Julian, *Or.* 6.202b; cf. Epictetus, *Disc.* 3.22.80. Urinating: D.L. 6.46. Masturbating: D.L. 6.46 and 69; *Epp. Diog.* 35, 42, and 44; Dio Chrys., *Disc.* 6.16-20; Athenaeus, *Deip.* 4.145ff. Defecating: Dio Chyrs., *Disc.* 8.36; Julian, *Or.* 6.202b,c.

[8] This is not the same as the abstracted qualities allegorized as χαραχτῆρες in the writings of Theophrastus.

[9] We also find him earlier in the writings of Cicero and elsewhere. Dio Chrysostom, Epictetus, Plutarch, and Cicero are available in the Loeb Classical Library. The corpus of pseudepigraphic letters is available with translation in Abraham J. Malherbe, *The Cynic Epistles: A Study Edition* (Missoula, Montana, 1977).

[10] Gunnar Rudberg, "Zur Diogenes Tradition" and "Zum Diogenes Typus," *Symbolae Osloenses* 14 (1935) 22-43 and 15 (1936) 1-18. Using methods parallel to those developed by Rudolf Bultmann, Rudberg tried to describe the development of the Cynic tradition through the history of these formal units. For a more specialized discussion of gnomic anthologies which include Diogenes traditions, see J. Barns, "A New Gnomologium," *Classical Quarterly*, 44 and 45 (1950 and 1951) 127-137, 1-19.

[11] M. Luz, "A Description of the Greek Cynic in the Jerusalem Talmud," *JSJ* 20 (1989) 49-60, has recently shown that the Rabbis were familiar with traditions about the Cynics.

[12] Ronald F. Hock and Edward N. O'Neil, *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric*: Volume I: *The Progymnasmata* (Atlanta, Georgia, 1986) contains all the chapters on the *chreia* found in ancient textbooks, with English translations. Hock and O'Neil have superseded

the comments on the *chreia* by Donald Lemen Clark, *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education* (New York, 1957) pp. 186-88. Nevertheless, Clark is still valuable for placing the *chreia* within the larger rhetoric curriculum.

[13] Hock and O'Neil, *The Chreia* p. 82-3, text and translation. Cf. Aphthonius' (late fourth/early fifth century) definition, "A chreia is a concise reminiscence aptly attributed to some character" (Hock and O'Neil, pp. 224-5).

[14] The textbooks disagree where exactly in the curriculum the *chreia* should be introduced. Quintilian included the manipulation of *chreiai* among the initial exercises performed with the *grammatikos* (Cf. Hock and O'Neil, p. 21). Theon's first exercises involve inflection of the *chreia*, a procedure not found in later textbooks. Since inflection was a skill learned with the *grammatikos*, this suggests that by the late fourth or early fifth century when Aphthonius wrote his *Progymnasmata* the *chreia* was introduced at the beginning of rhetorical training.

[15] There was some variation among treatises on rhetorical education concerning the exercises to be performed with the *chreia*. On these differences, see Hock and O'Neil, especially pp. 35-41.

[16] Henry A. Fischel, "Studies in Cynicism and the Ancient Near East: The Transformation of a *Chria*," [*sic*], in *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough*, ed. J. Neusner, (Leiden, 1968), p. 374.

[17] Hermogenes, writing in the second century, has one *chreia* attributed to Diogenes out of three examples; Aphthonius of Antioch (late fourth, early fifth century), who appears to be dependent on Hermogenes for his selection, has one Diogenes *chreia* of four; Nicolaus of Myra, writing in the sixth century uses one of eight. Although Aphthonius became the standard rhetorical textbook sometime after the first half of the sixth century, Theon continued to be read (cf. Hock and O'Neil, p. 212).

[18] Diogenes Laertius cites a certain "Sale of Diogenes" by Menippus (6.29) and a book of the same title by Eubulus (6.31), as well as books of *chreiai* by Hecato (6.32) and Metrocles (6.33) as his sources. On Diogenes Laertius' sources for Diogenes of Sinope see K. v. Fritz, "Quellenuntersuchung zu Leben und Philosophie des Diogenes von Sinope," *Philologos Suppl.* 18.2 (1926); Höistad, *Cynic Hero*, p. 116; Richard Hope, *The Book of Diogenes Laertius* (New York, 1930). See also Rudberg, "Zur Diogenes Tradition," and "Zur Diogenes Typos."

[19] The full range of such details can be found in Diogenes Laertius' life of Diogenes, *Lives of the Philosophers* 6.20-81.

[20] The edition cited here is *Joannis Stobaei Anthologium*, ed. C. Wachsmuth and O. Hense, 5 vols., (Berlin, 1884-1923), second edition, 1958. Of continuing usefulness is *Joannis Stobaei Florilegium*, ed. Augustus Meineke, 4 vols., (Leipzig, 1855-57); this edition uses a different numbering system from Wachsmuth and Hense.

[21] Photius, *Bibl.* cod. 167.

[22] For an index to these citations, see Wachsmuth and Hense. Most of the Diogenes material has been translated into French by Léonce Paquet and appears interspersed throughout his own Diogenes anthology in *Les Cyniques Grecs*, pp. 59-108. When Photius lists all the writers represented in John of Stobi's collection, he make special note of the Cynics included.

[23] During the eighth century John of Damascus, often regarded as the last writer of the Patristic period, compiled an anthology in much the same style as John of Stobi's anthology, grouping quotations under various headings. John of Damascus, however,

drew his material primarily from Christian authors, mostly theologians. Materials from profane and non-Christian sources make up a small part of the *Sacred Parallels*, but among these pieces of the pagan world are twelve sayings attributed to Diogenes. Selections from "profane" authors are included in the fourth volume of Meineke's edition of John of Stobi. See John of Damascus, *Sacra Parallela*, PG 94. On John of Damascus see B. Kotter, "John Damascene, St.," *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 7, 1047-9. Karl Holl, "Die *Sacra Parallela* des Johannes Damascenus," *Texte und Untersuchungen* 16 (1897) 1-392 argues convincingly for the authenticity of the work. Also worthy of mention are the few sayings of Diogenes in the so-called "*Florilegium Monacense*" once attributed to a seventh writer named Maximus—most likely not Maximus the Confessor, but for which a date as late as the late ninth through early eleventh century has also been suggested. The text is included in the fourth volume of Meineke's edition of John of Stobi's *Anthology*, pp. 267-290. On the date see A. Ehrhard, "Zu den 'Sacra Parallela' des Johannes Damascenus und dem Florilegium des 'Maximus'," *BZ* 10 (1901) 394-415. On further discussion of this question and on patristic florilegia in general see Marcel Richard, "Florilèges spirituels grecs," *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* 5, pp. 475-511.

[24] Dudley, *A History of Cynicism*, pp. 202-8.

[25] Julian, *Or.* 7. For Julian, the speech against Heracleius was an occasion to praise the value of mythology—a mythology which had been rejected by the growing number of Christians around him. Julian advocates a purer Cynicism which could be part of a pagan front against the Christians. Cf. Johannes Geffcken, *The Last Days of Greco-Roman Paganism*, trans. Sabine MacCormack (Amsterdam, 1978), p. 151.

[26] On Gregory and Maximus see below.

[27] Damascius' *Life of Isidorus* has been reconstructed from fragments appearing in Photius and in the *Suda*. *Damascii vitae Isidori reliquiae*, ed. Clemens Zintzen, (Hildesheim, 1967).

[28] Julian, *Or.* 6.

[29] Augustine, *Civ. Dei* 14.20.

[30] Lucian, *Peregrinus* 17; *Demonax* 3.

[31] Asmus, "Der Kyniker Sallustius," p. 511.

[32] On the history of the text and translations, see N.G. Wilson, *Saint Basil on the Value of Greek Literature* (London, 1975), pp. 72-3.

[33] Cf. H.I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. George Lamb, (Madison, Wisconsin, 1982), pp. 321-2, 340-2. While Marrou is right to observe that Basil is warning against the dangers inherent in reading pagan literature, he underestimates the degree to which Basil is presenting a defense of the extant canon.

[34] Basil, *Leg. lib. gent.* 10.1.

[35] Basil, *Leg. lib. gent.* 1.5 and 4.9.

[36] Cf. D.L. 6.54 and Stobaeus, 3.6.38.

[37] Basil, *Leg. lib. gent.* 9.3,4. Text and English translation, *Saint Basil: The Letters*, vol. 4, trans. Roy J. Deferrari and Martin R.P. McGuire, LCL, pp. 415-17.

[38] Basil, *Leg. lib. gent.* 9.20; trans. Deferarri and McGuire, pp. 425-7. Dio Chrys. *Or.* 6.6ff. is an expansion of the *chreia* which stands behind this statement. See also Plutarch, *Mor.* 499b and 604c.

[39] Julian, *Or.* 6. The date is suggested by Julian's reference to the summer solstice in the opening of the speech (181a). Cf. G.W. Bowersock, *Julian the Apostate* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1978), p. 81.

[40] On the terms δόξα and ἄδοξος in Cynicism see Malherbe, "Ps-Heraclitus, Ep. 4: The Divinization of the Wise Man," *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 21 (1978) 60.

[41] P.R. Coleman-Norton, "St. Chrysostom and the Greek Philosophers," *ClassPhil* 25 (1930) 305. On Diogenes and other Cynics, see pp. 307-9.

[42] John Chrysostom, *Adversus oppugnatores vitae monasticae* II.4; PG 47, 337.

[43] John Chrysostom, *Ad. op.vit. monast.* II.5, PG 47, 339.

[44] Furthermore, Chrysostom, ever suspicious of pretension, praised Diogenes and Crates, as well as Socrates for not having mastered the art of eloquence—an ironic point perhaps in light of Chrysostom's rhetorical skill. John Chrysostom, *Ad. op. vit. monast.* III.11, PG, 47, 367. Socrates, of course, was remembered as an opponent of the sophists.

[45] Cf. the *Life of Melania the Younger* and the remarks of Elizabeth A. Clark in "Ascetic Renunciation and Feminine Advancement: A Paradox of Late Ancient Christianity," *Anglican Theological Review* 63 (1981) 240-257. The subject of parental resistance to the ascetic life deserves further study.

[46] John Chrysostom, *Liber in Sanctum Babylam contra Julianum et contra Gentiles* 8, PG 50, 545; English translation by Margaret A. Schatkin in *Saint John Chrysostom, Apologist*, FOTC 73, 100-101. On the date of the text, see Schatkin's introduction, pp. 15-16.

[47] John Chrysostom, *De S. Babyla* 9, PG 50, 546; trans. Schatkin, pp. 102-3.

[48] Cf. D.L. 6.46, 69.

[49] Julian, *Orat.* 6.193d, 202c. Cf. *Epp. Diog.* 6 and 42.

[50] Cf. Lampe, *s.v.* This meaning can be found in Christian liturgical texts.

[51] John Chrysostom, *Ad viduam juniorem* 6, PG 48, 607; cf. NPNF (first series) IX, p. 126. On the question of how widespread familiarity with Diogenes was in Late Antiquity, we note that Chrysostom writes to this widow that she did not need to learn who the pagan philosophers he was referring to were from him, since "you know Epaminondas, Socrates, Aristeides, Diogenes, and Crates...better than I do."

[52] John Chrysostom, *Homiliae in 1 Cor.* 35.4, PG 61, 302; English trans. NPNF (first series) XII, p. 212.

[53] Greg. Naz., *Ep.* 98; *Gregor von Nazianz: Briefe*, ed. Paul Gallay, (Berlin, 1969) pp. 80-81. A German translation is available: *Gregor von Nazianz: Briefe*, trans. Michael Wittig (Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur 13), (Stuttgart, 1981).

[54] Greg. Naz., *De vita sua*, ed. Christoph Jungck, (Heidelberg, 1974), ll. 767-8; English translation, Denis Molaise Meehan, FOTC 75, p. 99.

[55] Greg. Naz., *Orations* 25 and 26. The identification of the Maximus of *De vita sua* with the Hero of *Orations* 25 and 26 is certain. On the Maximus affair see the excellent discussion by Justin Mossay, *Grégoire de Nazianze: Discours* 24-26, SC. 284, pp. 120-141.

[56] One thinks, of course, of Socrates. On Christian attitudes toward Socrates, see J. Geffcken, *Sokrates und das alte Christentum* (Heidelberg, 1908).

[57] Greg. Naz., *Or.* 25.2, ed. Mossay, p. 158.

[58] Greg. Naz., *Or.* 25.3.

[59] On Cynics as dogs, see Ferrand Sayre, *Greek Cynicism*, pp. 4-5. Serious doubts concerning the etymology of the term "Cynic" and a discussion of the ancient (non-Christian) interpretations of the title can be found in Heinz Schulz-Falkenthal, "Kyniker—Zur inhaltlichen Deutung des Namens," *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift (gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe); Martin-Luther Universität, Halle-Wittenberg* 26.2 (1977) 41-9. For dog = Cynic in collections of Cynic *chreiai*, see D.L.

6.33, 40, 61, 77; *Gnomologium Vaticanum*, 175, 194; Athenaeus, *Deip.* 5.216b; *Florilegium Monacense* 155 = Meinecke, 4.278; Stobaeus, 4.55.11; *Anth. Grec.* 7.63-68.

[60] Greg. Naz., *Or.* 25.2, ed. Mossay, pp. 158-160.

[61] Greg. Naz., *Or.* 25.7.

[62] Greg. Naz., *De vita sua*, ll. 750-1043.

[63] Greg. Naz., *De vita sua*, ll. 974-5. Herakles was a hero for the Cynics. See Dio Chrys., *Disc.* 1.59-84; Malherbe, "Ps.-Heraclitus Ep. 4," *passim.*

[64] Greg. Naz., *De vita sua*, ll. 1030-1033.

[65] Greg. Naz., Poem 1.2.10, ll. 215-16; PG 37, 696.

[66] Greg. Naz., Poem I.2.10, ll. 218-27.

[67] For a general treatment of Gregory's attitudes toward wealth and poverty, see Bernard Coulie, *Les richesses dans l'oeuvre de Saint Grégoire de Nazianze* (Louvain, 1985).

[68] Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Graecarum affectionum curatio*, ed. and French trans. Pierre Canivet, SC 57 (2 vols.). Canivet dates the work from the early 420's; however, this may be too early. Cf. Canivet, *Histoire d'une enterprise apologétique au ve siècle*, (Paris 1957), p. v.

[69] Thdt., *Affect.* 1.24,50; 3.53; 6.20; 12.32,48-9.

[70] Thdt., *Affect.* 12.48.

[71] Thdt., *Affect.* 12.49; cf. Clem., *Strom.* 4.19.121. With Crates he associates the view that "hunger is a poultice for sexual desire, even if it is a noose" (12.49), a view which was not unlike those held among Christian ascetics in Theodoret's own time, including many of those about whom he wrote in his *Religious History.* Theodoret attributes to Antisthenes the opinion that folly is superior to pleasure (Thdt. 12.47, cf. Clem. 2.20.121; Euseb., *PE*, 4.13.7).

[72] Thdt., *Affect.* 12.46.

[73] Thdt., *Affect.* 12.32.

[74] Thdt., *Provid.* 6, PG 83, 649; French trans., Yvan Azéma, *Discours sur la providence* (Paris, 1954), p. 207.

[75] Augustine, *Civ. Dei* 14.20; trans. John O'Meara, Augustine, *City of God* (London, 1984), pp. 581-2.

[76] Concerning Cynics in his own time, Augustine writes, "Even now we see that there are still Cynic philosophers about.... [N]one of them dares to act like Diogenes. If any of them were to venture to do so they would be overwhelmed, if not with a hail of stones, at any rate with a shower of spittle from the disgusted public." Trans. O'Meara, p. 582.

I wish to thank John Gager, Peter Brown, Martha Himmelfarb, Garth Fowden, and Gene Rogers who read and commented on earlier drafts of this paper. I also acknowledge the institutional support provided by a Princeton University Fellowship, a Junior Fellowship in Byzantine Studies at Dumbarton Oaks in 1990-91, and a Research Council New Faculty Grant from the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Dept. of Religious Studies,
108 Foust Building, *Greensboro*, NC 27412-5001

Vigiliae Christianae 47 (1993), 50-77, E.J. Brill, Leiden

JEROME: THE "VIR TRILINGUIS" AND THE "HEBRAICA VERITAS"[1]

BY

STEFAN REBENICH

Martin Luther was never an admirer of Jerome. In his famous Table-Talks he called him a babbler,[2] pointed out that there is more erudition in Aesop's fables than in the whole of Jerome, and gave utterance to his hope that God may forgive Jerome the damage he had done by his doctrinal teaching; the man was, in Luther's opinion, obviously in need of a wife since with a female companion he would have written so many things in a different way.[3] On the other hand, Jerome's Latin translation of the Bible, the so-called *Vulgate*, won the outspoken appreciation of the intransigent Reformer,[4] who in this respect shared the Humanists', especially Erasmus's positive assessment of Jerome's work.[5] Luther and the Humanists were impressed both by Jerome's knowledge of languages and his recourse to the Greek and Hebrew text of the Bible for his translation. Hence it is not surprising that Albrecht Dürer depicted not only the learned ascetic in his study but also, on an engraving of 1492, the translator of the Old and New Testament dealing with Latin, Greek and Hebrew versions of the Bible.[6]

Still today Jerome's name is bound up with Hebrew scholarship and, of course, the Vulgate. But we must not forget that the passionate controversies in Jerome's days about his translation of the Old Testament *iuxta hebraeos*, i.e. according to the Hebrew text, and consequently the quarrels concerning the inspiration of the Septuagint and about the Old Testament canon had the consequence that his translations, including the Gospels, were recognized only very gradually, that is to say long after his death. Not until the ninth century was his version victorious; even then, up to the thirteenth century monks and priests were still copying and reading the Old Latin versions of the Scriptures. In Jerome's lifetime his translation could not even supersede the *Vetus Latina* in Italy, though Rome was the place where he started to propagate his new version with the ideological and financial help of influen-

tial and wealthy friends.[7] Augustine, Cassiodorus and Gregory the Great, to give only three examples, used both versions at the same time. And in practice, the text of the Vulgate quickly became corrupted with passages out of the Old Latin version. Among the three oldest Gospel-manuscripts of the Vulgate which date back to the fifth century there is only one which has not borrowed elements from the *Vetus Latina*; the other two manuscripts have hybrid texts.[8]

Modern scholarship has made an effort to reconstruct Jerome's translations of the New and Old Testament. It has thus emerged that he only revised the text of the Gospels, but not of Acts, the Epistles or Revelation since the passages Jerome cites from these books of the New Testament differ very often from the text of the Vulgate. And in his commentaries on the Pauline Epistles to Philemon, the Galatians, the Ephesians and Titus, which were written in 386, i.e. shortly after the alleged revision of the New Testament,[9] Jerome never referred to his own translation, but only criticized an anonymous *Latinus interpres* on several occasions. Stylistic reasons, especially regarding the Latin translation of Acts, finally shake his declaration made in *De viris illustribus* that he had translated the whole New Testament from the Greek into Latin.[10] This statement might at best be understood as an intention which was never fully realized, unless one would like to call it an intentional exaggeration.[11] The Vulgate version of Acts, the Pauline Epistles and Revelation is now ascribed to an author working in Rome at the end of the fourth century; the modern editors of the *Vetus Latina* in particular are prepared to identify this translator with Rufinus the Syrian who is said to have been a friend of Jerome and Epiphanius of Salamis until he, at the beginning of the fifth century, went over to the Pelagian movement to appear as the author of the *Liber de Fide*.[12]

Jerome started his revision of the Bible with the translation of the Gospels during his stay in Rome from 382 to 385 after he had won the financial and theological support of the Roman bishop Damasus for his ambitious project.[13] He also corrected the Latin text of the Psalter according to the Septuagint in Rome and lauded himself that he made substantial corrections though the work was done quickly (*cursim*). Shortly after his settlement in Bethlehem, judging by his own testimony, he undertook to revise the text of the Psalter again, but now according to the text of the *Hexapla*, since due to the copyists' blunder many errors had slipped into his Roman version. This revised version was

dedicated to Jerome's aristocratic friends and *patronae*, Paula and Eustochium.[14] About 392, ultimately, he declared that he translated the Psalter from the Hebrew text.[15] A Latin version known under the name *Psalterium Romanum*, which had been used in all Roman and many Italian churches until the sixteenth century, was taken for Jerome's Roman translation according to the Septuagint. But in more recent times it was shown that this version in contrast to the so-called *Psalterium Gallicanum* cannot be attributed to Jerome. The latter Psalter reflects his second revision according to the *Hexapla* which had particularly spread over Gaul and which was made compulsory during the pontificate of Pius V (1566-1572). Since then the *Psalterium Romanum* has only been read in St Peter's. Jerome's *Psalterium iuxta hebraeos* however did not win recognition since this translation differed too drastically from the traditional Old Latin version which due to the ecclesiastical rites was the best known book of the Scriptures among Christians.[16]

We have now reached Jerome's translation of the Old Testament from Greek and Hebrew. A first version of the Old Testament on which Jerome started working immediately after his arrival in Bethlehem was based upon the text of the Septuagint, more precisely on the Hexaplaric text of the Septuagint. That important work of Origen Jerome could consult in the nearby library of Caesarea in Palestine.[17] The revision of the Psalter already referred to was followed by the Book of Job, which was also dedicated to Paula and Eustochium.[18] Handed down are also the prefaces to the Books of Solomon, i.e. Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs, and to the Chronicles.[19] The text of these books however has not survived. Despite some isolated remarks[20] suggesting that he had revised the whole canon of the Old Testament according to the Septuagint,[21] it is reasonable to assume, as Georg Grützmacher has already insisted, that Jerome's revision based upon the Septuagint, and the *Hexapla* respectively, only included the above-mentioned books of the holy Scriptures.[22]

This work had to remain unfinished since Jerome increasingly devoted himself to the *Hebraica veritas*, and about 390, convinced of the superiority of the Hebrew text, he started on a new Latin translation of the complete Old Testament from the original text. Both the relative and the absolute chronology of his translations of the books of the Old Testament are controversial. In *De viris illustribus*, written in 393,[23] he states, "*vetus [sc. testamentum] iuxta hebraeum transtuli.*"[24] This is, as

well as the corresponding remark concerning his translation of the New Testament, most certainly incorrect since his own preface to Joshua makes it plain that he finished the translation of the Old Testament according to the Hebrew text in 405/406.[25] It appears that up to 392/93 Jerome had translated only the Psalter, the Prophets, the Books of Samuel and Kings, and Job.[26] The remaining books of the Hebrew canon as well as the deuterocanonical books Judith and Tobit were translated in the following fourteen years or so. The prefaces, but also the commentaries and many epistles demonstrate the occasion, intention, technique and theory of translation, and especially the criticism his new translations of the Old Testament *iuxta hebraeos* provoked.[27] The recourse to the *hebraica veritas* was firmly rejected by those who, like Epiphanius or Rufinus, recognized the Septuagint as the only true and legitimate, since indeed divinely inspired version of the Old Testament. In addition those, like Augustine, who did have doubts about the authority of the Septuagint, nevertheless joined the critics, because the text was familiar to the congregation. The arguments adduced by Jerome to legitimize his ambitious project and his inconsistent remarks on the Septuagint are generally known and require no new compilation.[28]

The translations *iuxta hebraeos* were completed (and defended) by an extensive exegetical literature, that is to say by commentaries and by quite a few letters. Special treaties were added like the *Hebrew Names*, or *Onomasticon (Liber interpretationis nominum hebraicorum*, or *Liber de nominibus hebraicis*),[29] the *Book of Places (Liber de situ et nominibus locorum hebraicorum)*[30] and the *Hebrew Questions (Quaestiones hebraicae in Genesim).*[31] During the last decades many scholars have made an effort to identify the works of preceding theologians Jerome was using in his commentaries and treatises. Several works were easily recognizable from Jerome's own information. Other sources from which he compiled could be reconstructed through detailed textual analysis. Thus, the extent of Jerome's dependence as an amazingly productive exegete on both Greek and Latin predecessors has now become apparent. Again and again Origen emerged as the inspiration of Jerome's textual criticism and exegesis of the Scripture even after the outbreak of the Origenistic controversy.[32] Some examples may be useful. Since numerous, and occasionally rather long fragments of Origen's commentaries on the Pauline Epistles have been identified, Rufinus's charge[33] that Jerome had plagiarized the heterodox

arguments of Origen (and also Apollinaris) and managed to disguise his borrowings could be proved.[34] In regard to his commentary on the Epistles of Paul to the Ephesians, Jerome legitimized and programmatically defined his method: "What I have done in that and other commentaries is to develop both my own opinion and that of others, stating clearly which are heretical and which catholic. This is the common rule and custom of those who undertake to explain books in commentaries: They give at length in their exposition the various opinions, and explain what is thought by themselves and by others."[35] Vigilant readers of his commentaries on the dodecapropheton had again discovered that Origen was his model, as Jerome admits. He thus tries to vindicate himself against the charge of making mere compilations from Origen[36] and replies: "What they consider a reproach, I regard as the highest praise, since I desire to imitate him [sc. Origen] who, I doubt not, is acceptable to all wise men..."[37]

It is now widely accepted that his contemporary critics were not mistaken in accusing Jerome of compilation. Thus Yves-Marie Duval has thoroughly analysed the tradition of the Christian and Rabbinic exegesis of Jonah to establish the sources of the commentary; his conclusion might be adopted for quite a few of Jerome's commentaries on the dodecapropheton: "L'essentiel de l'interprétation du Livre de Jonas que présente Jérôme a justement été puisé chez Origène."[38] The commentaries on the Gospel according to Matthew,[39] on Isaiah,[40] Ezekiel[41] or Daniel[42] could also be adduced, just as his homilies on the Psalms and his exegetical letters,[43] to demonstrate Jerome's dependence on Origen.[44] But only a fraction of Origen's work has survived, so that the full scale of Jerome's dependence cannot be reconstructed. That is also true for the works of other predecessors Jerome plagiarized. Sometimes, however, there are fortunate discoveries which shed light upon his working method. In 1941, for instance, a papyrus was found in Toura south of Cairo which contained a nearly complete version of the five-volume commentary of Didymus the Blind on Zechariah. In his prefaces to the commentaries on Hosea, Zechariah, and Malachi, Jerome had once more referred to authors he had employed for his work, for instance Origen, Hippolytus, Didymus, and Apollinaris.[45] The comparison between Didymus's and Jerome's commentary makes clear the wide extent of Jerome's borrowings.[46] Other Greek, but also Latin theologians Jerome copied could be identified. Though he sometimes mentioned their names and works in the *praefationes* of his com-

mentaries and other exegetical writing, he never indicated the scale of his compilation. Worth mentioning are Eusebius of Caesarea, Theodorus of Heraclea, Apollinaris of Laodicea, Eusebius of Emesa, Epiphanius of Salamis as well as Tertullian and Victorinus of Pettau.[47]

In fact, Jerome's approach to the works of preceding and contemporary Christian writers was not in the least different from his approach to secular literature: Since Pierre Courcelle's detailed study, ample evidence has accumulated indicating that Jerome had by no means read all those Greek historians, philosophers and theologians he pretended to have read and whose writings he quoted rather often in his works. He hardly ever read an Ignatius, a Polycarp, an Irenaeus or a Justin Martyr; of the Greek historians he was probably only acquainted with Josephus, whom he called *Graecus Livius.*[48] Many, not to say the majority of the authors and their works he cited were quoted second-hand as for instance Philo and Porphyry from Eusebius of Caesarea.[49] In his own lifetime, already Rufinus laughed at the amazing number of philosophers, historians and poets whose works Jerome pretended to have studied. Thus Rufinus inquired how it could be possible that Jerome had read letters of Pythagoras given that there is probably no single work of this philosopher preserved.[50] Jerome's reply was poor: "I was speaking not of their books but of their tenets, with which I was able to acquaint myself through Cicero, Brutus, and Seneca."[51]

Recognition of the extent of Jerome's carefully disguised plagiarism has naturally prompted doubt about his theological and exegetical originality. Many students of Jerome in this century have thus formed a negative opinion on the *doctor ecclesiae* which came so more easy since Jerome made ostentatious show of his exegetical qualities and wide reading. Two aspects, however, have quite often been neglected in this connection. First, as Yves-Marie Duval has shown, for instance for the commentary on Jonah,[52] Jerome imparted important tenets and theories of Greek exegetical literature to the Latin West. Jerome's rôle as an intermediary laid the foundation of the remarkable position he gained in the Scriptural exegesis of the Latin Church; in Western Christianity, in other words, his exegetical importance can properly be compared with the theological importance of Augustine. Secondly, compiling important and well-known writings of preceding authors was nothing unusual among Christian or secular writers in Antiquity. It was also totally in line with contemporary practice for Jerome to disguise his borrowings and allege that he was using the respective works directly.[53]

Moreover, we must not forget that the image of a learned exegete of Holy Scripture promoted by Jerome himself was absolutely necessary to obtain authority and prestige among contemporary Christians. Jerome thus had to prove and, if necessary, defend his exegetical qualities to insure the grants and benefits of Christian groups.

Very much to the point here was his reputation as *vir trilinguis*. The fame Jerome won through his Latin translation of the Bible—first called the Vulgate (i.e. *Biblia Sacra Vulgatae Editionis*) at the Council of Trent[54]—has at the same time implied the acceptance of his linguistic competence. And, in contrast to many other legends told of Jerome, this glorification rests entirely upon his own evidence. For it is precisely the acceptance of the linguistic competence claimed by Jerome himself which underlay recognition of his authority as a translator and commentator of Scripture both by contemporaries and later generations. Hence, it is not surprising that from the time of his stay in Rome Jerome repeatedly and carefully depicted himself as *vir trilinguis* with a command of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew.[55] He also reports of an earlier stage of his life, in the desert of Chalcis, that he spoke Syriac fluently,[56] and often mentions that he translated from the "Chaldee", i.e. from Aramaic.[57] Jerome could celebrate his knowledge of languages since he was aware that none of his contemporaries could come near to rivalling him.[58] These claims were quickly reflected in the literature of the time, especially his knowledge of the Hebrew tongue.[59]

Jerome's translations and, consequently, his linguistic competence, however, did not remain above criticism for ever. After the Humanists had already pointed out errors of translation and misreadings in those texts which referred to the *Hebraica veritas*,[60] Bernard de Montfaucon, the great Patristic scholar of the community St Maur, in his introduction to the edition of Eusebius of Caesarea's commentary on Isaiah, demonstrated that Jerome's allusion to Hebrew masters was drawn from the Eusebian source.[61] In this century, *Quellenforschung* has examined more closely the various passages where Jerome called Hebrew authorities to witness. Gustave Bardy was able to show in an article published in 1934 that the passages he had examined were taken directly from Jerome's sources, that is to say especially from Origen and Eusebius. Whereas his conclusion was still rather cautious in saying that his only intention was to make evident "qu'il ne fallait pas toujours faire une entière confiance à saint Jérôme lorsqu'il dit avoir reçu telle ou telle leçon de ses maîtres hébreux",[62] other scholars have been less

discreet. In particular Pierre Nautin, in his remarkable book on Origen, has undertaken to prove that Jerome, because he had virtually no command of Hebrew, was at least indirectly dependent on Origen whenever he referred to Jewish exegesis. Moreover, Jerome apparently had never even looked at the Origenic *Hexapla*, but knew that work only through Greek intermediaries, i.e. through Eusebius and Epiphanius. At the same time Nautin has made the highly controversial assertion that the great Alexandrinian theologian had already perceived the superiority of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament over the Septuagint; this too was a position Jerome adopted from his master.[63] Still more iconoclastic is his article on Jerome in the *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, in which he claims to prove that Jerome hardly knew a word of Hebrew! Whenever Jerome is quoting the transcribed Hebrew text or commenting on the Hebrew language he relies, it is assumed, upon his sources, namely Origen, Eusebius, and perhaps Acacius of Caesarea. The moment he withdraws from his sources, claims Nautin, everything is mere fabrication.[64] It follows that if indeed Jerome was not able to translate the Bible from the Hebrew original or solely to verify translations already made from the Hebrew his alleged translation of the Old Testament *iuxta hebraeos* had in fact been done on the basis of the Hexaplaric Septuagint. The commentaries on the other hand which quite often refer to the Hebrew text and Jewish exegesis "stellen oft nichts anderes als geringfügig veränderte Texte von Origenes dar."[65] To summarize Nautin's argument: The contemporary and subsequent recognition and admiration Jerome won as *vir trilinguis*, or—more precisely—as a Biblical scholar knowing Hebrew, is based upon fabrication, being nothing more than a false claim made by Jerome himself!

However, things are more complicated than Nautin pretends. It has long been recognized that Jerome was dependent on Origen as well as on other Greek scholars. That also implies that Jerome, in those cases where he said he has directly referred to Jewish traditions, might repeatedly have plagiarized his source. But does it necessarily follow that he had never used Rabbinic writings and established contact with Jewish scholars? To answer this question, it appears, apodictic statements generalizing isolated observations are not particularly useful; rather we need detailed studies which identify the specific Jewish and Christian sources Jerome compiled, in so far as they have survived, and analyse their importance for Jerome's translations and exegetical writings. His commentaries on Isaiah,[66] Jeremiah,[67] Daniel,[68] Jonah[69]

and the *Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim*[70] have already been examined to bring to light Christian as well as Jewish models and to elucidate their direct or indirect influence on Jerome's work. Adam Kamesar has been able to prove by a detailed comparison of the *Hebrew Questions* with the preserved fragments of earlier works, namely the *Liber nominum*, Origen's commentary on and excerpts from Genesis, the *quaestiones* of Eusebius of Emesa, and the Σύμμικτα ζητήματα of Acacius of Caesarea, that Jerome developed a new methodological approach by attaching a substantially greater importance to philological questions and problems than his Greek predecessors. At the same time, Jerome also went beyond his predecessors by utilizing new Hebrew material which he did not hesitate to integrate into his arguments.[71] Thus he must have gone back to the Hebrew original and tackled Jewish exegetical literature in the *Hebrew Questions*; the same seems true of some of Jerome's other works.[72]

How profound then was his command of Hebrew? There is in fact a wealth of detailed linguistic studies examining Jerome's knowledge and competence of languages which Nautin ignores.[73] Even the critical examination carried out by E. Burstein reveals that Jerome was obviously able to read and to understand Hebrew,[74] although he rightly demands further research in this field. The analysis of the preceding Christian and Jewish exegesis and the linguistic evidence clearly disprove Nautin's hypotheses. Jerome had direct access to Rabbinic literature and was at least able to understand a Hebrew text. His translation of the Old Testament *iuxta hebraeos* and his conception of the *hebraica veritas* was indeed an outstanding and original achievement.

Did any contemporary question Jerome's linguistic competence? In this connection the translation of Jonah 4,6 is revealing. There, in the Hebrew text, a plant is mentioned called קיקיון which on God's command grew up fast in order to throw its shade over Jonah. Jerome translated the Hebrew word as *hedera*, ivy. As a result, he was heavily criticized in Rome because the Old Latin Bible rendered קיקיון as *cucurbita* rather than Jerome's *hedera*. And a certain Canterius, a descendant of the *gens Cornelia* and allegedly of Asinius Pollio, accused Jerome of sacrilege.[75] The man in Bethlehem, driven onto the defensive, tried to refute the charge both by personal polemics and botanical as well as philological considerations. The plant, called *ciceia* in Syriac and Punic, he explained, was a fast growing bush which was to be found especially in dry places in Palestine; the Latin tongue had no equivalent so that,

to avoid a new word, he had translated the expression with *hedera*, ivy, following the *veteres translatores*, who have κισσός, and not with *cucurbita*, gourd, found in the Septuagint and the Old Latin version.[76] The paragraph is rather illuminating. It shows the kinds of criticism Jerome's translations of the the Old Testament *iuxta hebraeos* had to face in Roman circles. The allusion to the Republican descent of the above-mentioned Canterius[77]— a malicious *sobriquet* rather than a real name — suggests that he belonged to the Roman senatorial aristocracy and could, thanks to his superior social standing, seriously threaten the propagation of Jerome's translations and commentaries in Rome. This might explain the harshness of Jerome's defence as well as his extensive refutation based upon both local botanical observations and philological competence. It is also striking that the new translation *ivy* had obviously not been criticized for philological, but for theological reasons; that is to say, Jerome was accused of *sacrilegium* since his translation differed from the traditional and thus divinely inspired reading of the Bible.

The incident of the gourd was not even settled then. Rufinus referred to the Roman critic in his *Apology against Jerome* by recommending that upon the ancient tombs the gourds should, for Jerome's sake, be replaced by ivy.[78] Jerome ignored this jibe, but did come back to Canterius's case. He said he had never by name insulted a person in his works, but "if I speak against ill-disposed persons, and wound with the point of my pen some Luscius Lanuvinus or an Asinius Pollio of the race of the Cornelii, if I repel the attacks of a man of boastful and envious spirit, and aim all my shafts at a single butt, why does he divide with others the wounds meant for him alone?"[79] In Africa too the new translation was found disturbing. The bishop of Oea (Tripoli) in Tripolitania had, according to a letter of Augustine written in 403,[80] adopted Jerome's new translation of Jonah. But when he read out the key passage to his congregation a tumult broke out since the new word *hedera* was unfamiliar and they obviously expected the traditional *cucurbita*. It was even rumoured that the text was forged. Thus some resident Jews were consulted who pronounced against Jerome's translation explaining that the reading of the Hebrew manuscripts corroborated the translation found in the Septuagint and the Old Latin version. As a result, the bishop had to stigmatize and erase the word. Jerome, of course, replied to Augustine, especially since the latter had tied up this story with his principal criticism of Jerome's translation of

the Old Testament from the Hebrew. He argued that the whole matter had been settled for a long time, attacked Canterius again, referred to the detailed philological and botanical argument in his commentary on Jonah, finally assailed the Jews who "*malitia vel inperitia* (through malice or ignorance)" pronounced in favour of the Septuagint, and insisted that his translation corresponds with the Hebrew manuscripts.[81] This goes to prove not only that theological reservations were brought forward against Jerome's new translation, but also that in this special case a group of "traditionalists" accused Jerome of an obvious misrendering after consulting Jewish scholars, probably Rabbis. His polemical as well as linguistic refutation both in his commentary on Jonah and in his letter to Augustine, underline how extremely important it was to Jerome to defend his Latin version of the holy Scriptures and, at the same time, his reputation as a Biblical scholar. Acceptance of his theological and linguistic competence was vital to the programme of the *scientia litterarum*. Jerome, the Christian *litteratus*, wanted to make himself the spiritual leader of wealthy Christian intellectuals, who in their turn were able to support Jerome's ambitious literary projects and ascetic community in Bethlehem.[82] That Jerome himself was sure of his translation of קיקיון,[83] or more precisely, that he had conferred with Jewish scholars on the point follows from his self-assured call upon Augustine that the latter, if there were any doubts about the translation *iuxta hebraeos*, should consult Jews, but not Jews such as those asked about Jonah 4,6, who were either ignorant or conspirators.[84]

Rufinus—who in his bitter quarrels with his former friend hardly ever forgot to make public all of Jerome's half-true and untrue remarks—at no time doubted that Jerome had command of Hebrew. It is worth looking, for instance, at his *Apologia contra Hieronymum* where he clearly, but tediously, demonstrated Jerome's erstwhile and dogmatically untroubled admiration of Origen,[85] his violation of his solemn oath he had taken to the Judge that he would never again possess or read worldy books,[86] and Jerome's efforts at disguising the dependence on Origen in his commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians.[87] Finally, Rufinus made reference to a letter of Jerome in which he tried to explain his relation to Origen to his Roman friends Pammachius and Oceanus. There Jerome was polemizing against Rufinus: "In my younger days I was carried away with great passion for learning, yet I was not, like some, presumptuous enough to teach myself." At Antioch he frequently listened to Apollinaris of Laodicea, went on to

Alexandria to hear Didymus, and "yet once more I came to Jerusalem and Bethlehem. What trouble and expense it cost me to get Baranina to teach me under the cover of night. For by his fear of the Jews he presented to me in his own person a second edition of Nicodemus. Of all of these I have frequently made mention in my works."[88] Rufinus, in his *Apology*, picked up the gauntlet: "I think very little, indeed, of one reproach which he levels against me, and think it hardly worthy of a reply; that, namely, in which, in recounting the various teachers he hired, as he says, from the Jewish synagogue, he says, in order to give me a sharp prick, «I have not been my own teacher, like some people,» meaning me of course, for he brings the whole weight of his invective to bear against me from beginning to end."[89] Whereas Jerome did not in his whole life stay more than thirty days in Alexandria, he, Rufinus, listened to Didymus for eight years altogether and visited the majority of the Egyptian desert fathers. But what did Rufinus think about Jerome's Jewish teacher? "It is not of them that he is thinking when he says that he has not like me been his own teacher. It is of Barrabas whom, unlike me, he took as his teacher from the synagogue, and of Porphyry by whose introduction he and not I had his introduction into Logic. Pardon me for this that I have preferred to be thought of as an unskilled and unlearned man rather than to be called the disciple of Barrabas. For, when Christ and Barrabas were offered for our choice, I in my simplicity made choice of Christ; you, it appears, are willing to join your shouts with those who say, «Not this man but Barrabas.» ... From that other friend of yours, Barrabas, whom you chose out of the synagogue rather than Christ, you learnt to hope for a resurrection not in power but in frailty ..."[90] Barrabas, of course, is to be identified with Jerome's *praeceptor* Baranina as follows from his reply to Rufinus's onslaught: "I am told, further, that you, philosopher, touch with some critical sharpness upon some points of my letter, and, with the well-known wrinkles rising on your forehead and your eyebrows knitted, make sport of me with a wit worthy of Plautus, for having said that I had a Jew named Barrabas for my teacher. I do not wonder at your writing Barrabas for Baranina, the letters of the names being somewhat similar, when you allow yourself such a license in changing the names themselves, as to turn Eusebius into Pamphilus, and a heretic into a martyr... I never spoke of him as my master; I merely wished to illustrate my method of studying the holy Scriptures by saying that I had read Origen just in the same way as I had taken lessons from this Jew; *neque enim hebraeas litteras a te discere debui.*"[91]

The ample quotations show that Rufinus—in contrast to his remarks about Didymus the Blind—was not at all in doubt that Jerome had taken lessons from a Jewish teacher named Baranina who, as we may conclude, introduced Jerome to the Hebrew language and Rabbinic literature. Rufinus did not deny his opponent's knowledge of Hebrew, but was adducing theological as well as anti-Jewish arguments which culminated in the charge that Jerome betrayed Christ for that Jewish teacher. The alteration of the name is a brilliant polemical trick to which his antagonist had to reply. Jerome here reproached Rufinus with licence, *licentia.* And in the third book of his *Apology*, the *vir trilinguis* once again played his trump-card by insisting that his adversary, unlike himself, was ignorant of Hebrew.[92] It is open to question to what extent Jerome's reply is effective; but Rufinus explicitly corroborates Jerome's references to Jewish teachers and scholars in Bethlehem. It is likely that Rufinus knew about the *praeceptor* Baranina not only by reading Jerome's works, but also through pieces of news coming from Bethlehem to Jerusalem, when he and Melania the Elder stayed there. The evidence for Jewish-Christian relations in Late Antiquity[93] also suggests that, especially in Palestine, Rufinus had, and made use of, the opportunity to ask Jewish scholars to examine Jerome's translation from the Hebrew and his exegetical writing. That Jews and Christians communicated on controversial issues follows at least from the example of the bishop of Oea and from that of Sophronius who consulted a Jew about Messianic passages in the Psalter and received the answer that these sentences were not to be found in the Hebrew text.[94]

The numerous references to Hebrew scholars, among whom only Baranina is particularly mentioned,[95] and Hebrew sources[96] make evident that Jerome did not only indirectly employ the Jewish tradition *via* Greek authors, but was in direct contact with Jews who were helping him in translating the Old Testament, in defining the canon, and in tackling exegetical questions. It was their support and their competence which enabled Jerome to propagate emphatically and defend persistently his works based upon the *hebraica veritas.* There is no denying that he knew Hebrew;[97] not least, scattered remarks on its pronunciation prove that he had some familiarity with the language.[98] How fluently he read or even spoke and wrote Hebrew requires further examination. It may be that his Hebrew was at the same level as his Aramaic; in the preface to the translation of the Book of Daniel he frankly admitted, "to this day I can read and understand Chaldee better

than I can pronounce it."[99] He had perhaps only received elementary instruction in both languages. But any examination of his linguistic competence has to face the problem that it is nearly impossible to reconstruct the scale of Jewish help Jerome enjoyed during his work with the Hebrew original. It is evident that throughout almost all his time in Bethlehem he was able to consult Jewish scholars; the eminent importance of the *Hebraei* is proved not least by the fact that Jerome spared no expense to employ Jewish scholars. In letter 84, for instance, we find: "*quo labore, quo pretio Baranina nocturnum habui praeceptorem.*"[100] In the preface to his translation of the Book of Job Jerome wrote, "I remember that in order to understand this volume, I paid a not inconsiderable sum for the services of a teacher, a native of Lydda, who was among the Hebrews reckoned to be in the front rank."[101] He certainly paid the Jew too who gave lessons to him on Aramaic and encouraged him when he was almost despairing of the Book of Daniel.[102] Already while translating the Chronicles according to the Hexaplaric Septuagint, he had consulted "*de Tiberiade legis quondam doctorem, qui apud Hebraeos admirationi habebatur*".[103] The bills for the language lessons and Hebrew scholars, it appears, were paid by Jerome's wealthy patrons, Paula and Eustochium.

The most serious charge Jerome had to face while translating the Old Testament according to the Hebrew text consisted in the argument that he was rejecting the divinely inspired version of the Septuagint and *eo ipso* Judaized the Old Testament.[104] His recourse to the *hebraica veritas* and the Jewish exegesis as well as the subsequent criticism of the Septuagint and the Old Latin versions based upon it, led to the accusation that he was deviating from Christian tradition.[105] It was with precisely this charge that Rufinus attacked Jerome in his *Apologia contra Hieronymum*: "This action is yours, my brother, yours alone. It is clear that no one in the church has been your companion or confederate in it, but only that Barrabas whom you mention so frequently. What other spirit than that of Jews would dare to tamper with the records of the church which have been handed down from the Apostles? It is they, my brother, you who were most dear to me before you were taken captive by the Jews, it is they who are hurrying you into this abyss of evil."[106] Since Jerome vehemently defended the superiority of the *hebraica veritas* both his work and his person were sharply rejected by those who adhered to the inspiration of the Septuagint. This might explain Jerome's different, even inconsistent remarks on the Septuagint which

have attracted the attention of many scholars. His statements about the (Hexaplaric) Septuagint are not only contingent upon the time, but also upon the addressee of the work. Thus it is no accident that he asked the following rhetorical question in his *Apology* against Rufinus: "Am I likely to have said anything derogatory to the seventy translators, whose work I carefully purged from corruptions and gave to Latin readers many years ago, and daily expound at our conventual gatherings; whose version of the Psalms has so long been subject of my meditation and my song? Was I so foolish as to wish to forget in old age what I learnt in youth? All my treatises have been woven out of statements warranted by their version."[107] Shortly before, he had proved that a letter, today unfortunately lost, which then was circulating in Africa, was a forgery; the letter, in which he was said to have condemned his translations from the Hebrew, understandably disturbed his Roman friends.[108] In his commentary on Ecclesiastes, dedicated to Paula and Eustochium in 388 and propagated by his Roman circle,[109] Jerome stated, "I have translated from the Hebrew, adapting my words as much as possible to the form of the Septuagint, but only in those places in which they did not diverge far from the Hebrew."[110] But even in his letter to the Goths Sunnia and Fretela, written after 404 and before 410, which, at the addressees' request, was dealing with the differences between his translation of the Psalms according to the *Hexapla* and the Septuagint version, even in this letter Jerome was defending some traditional readings though they diverge from the Hebrew text.[111] On writing this letter he had already for many years been disseminating in other works his translation of the Old Testament *iuxta hebraeos* and his conception of the *hebraica veritas*. There is no doubt that Jerome himself considered his translation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew superior to the Septuagint and even to the text of the Hexaplaric Septuagint since his version followed the original more closely. Again and again he demanded his readers to compare his version with the Septuagint[112] and, if necessary, to consult Jewish scholars. But the sharp criticism which his successively published Latin translations of the Old Testament evoked, and which could be silenced neither through ardent polemic nor through careful argument, Jerome answered in two ways. First, he philologically as well as theologically legitimized his recourse to the *hebraica veritas* and thus tried to provide his friends and patrons, who were responsible for propagating his works, with more or less sophisticated arguments to prove the superiority of his version; these

arguments were also aimed at winning new supporters and patrons who always were of vital importance for Jerome and his congregation in Bethlehem. Secondly, he repressed his underlying reservations and criticism and sometimes acknowledged the Hexaplaric text, even the Septuagint whenever it was necessary to repulse the attacks of those who, like Rufinus, considered the Septuagint and consequently the Old Latin versions as to be inspired by God, and thus went on to accuse Jerome of heresy. This accusation was no less serious than the charge that he adhered to Origenistic heterodoxies. Jerome had no choice but fighting against both charges to defend his reputation and his authority as a translator and commentator of the Bible, even if this necessarily entagled him in contradictions.

Notes

[1] An earlier version of this paper was read to the Patristic Seminar in Cambridge on 27 January 1992. I would like to thank the members of the Seminar for their comments and criticisms of the paper. At various earlier stages I have greatly benefited from the help of Dr Menachem Fisch (Tel Aviv/Berlin), Dr Peter Heather (London) and Dr Wolfram Kinzig (Cambridge), to whom I am extremely grateful.

The following works are referred to in abbreviated form: Cavallera I-II = F. Cavallera, *Saint Jerome. Sa vie et son oeuvre*, 2 vols, Louvain Paris 1928. G. Grützmacher, *Hieronymus. Eine biographische Studie zur alten Kirchengeschichte*, 3 vols, Leipzig 1901-08.

Kelly = J.N.D. Kelly, *Jerome. His Life, Writings and Controversies*, London 1975.

Rebenich, Hieronymus = St. Rebenich, *Hieronymus und sein Kreis. Prosopographische und sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchungen, Historia-Einzelschriften* 72, Stuttgart 1992.

Though I have usually given reference to publications of Jerome's works in standard series, a few remarks may be useful. Jerome's letters and commentaries are, if available, cited from the major editions in the Vienna corpus (*CSEL*) and in *Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina* (*CCL*), the prefaces of the Vulgate from the two-volume edition of R. Weber, Stuttgart 1969, ^{3}1983. The standard edition of his Chronicle is by R. Helm (*GCS*, ^{2}1956, ^{3}1984), his *De viris illustribus* is now available in a new edition by A. Ceresa-Gastaldo (Florenz 1988). His commentary on Jonah is cited from the edition by Y.-M. Duval in *Sources Chrétiennes*, 323 (Paris 1985). The English version of quotations is, with minor additions, cited from the translation in *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. iii and vi.

[2] Martin Luther, *Weimarer Ausgabe* (= *W.A.*) *Tischreden* iv, no. 5009 (p. 611): "Hieronimus ist ein schwetzer wie Erasmus et voluit granditoque dicere et non successit. Pollicetur aliquid lectori, nihil autem praestat. Et miror tamen, quod eo tempore, vix 300 annis post Christum, in tanta cognitione linguarum tanta caecitas fuit in ecclesia. Augustinus est disputator; der wil wissen und nicht wehnen, und besicht einen auch. Hic

est summus theologus, qui post apostolos scripserunt...''; cf. *W.A. Briefwechsel*, no. 35, i 90.

[3] *W.A. Tischreden* i, no. 445 (p. 194): ''Fide Christi utcumque puto servatum Hieronymum, sed den schaden, den er per suam doctrinam thun hat, den vergeb yhm Got. Ich weys wol, das er mir seer geschadet hat. Ipse vituperat mulieres et loquitur de mulieribus absentibus. Darumb wolt ich yhm gonnen, das er ein weyb het gehabt; so vil ding anders geschriben haben. Est miraculum, das in soviel buchern kein vers de Christo steht, et tamen reprehendit idem in Sexto. Ergo nullum doctorem scio, quem aeque oderim, cum tamen ardentissime eum amaverim et legerim. In Aesopo certe plus est eruditionis quam in toto Hieronymo. Si tamen urgeret opera fidei et fructus evangelii; tantum dicit de ieiuniis etc. Staupicius meus aliquando dicebat: «Ich wolt gern wissen, wie der man selig worden.» Et antecessor eius Doctor Prolus dixit: «Ich wolt S. Hieronymum nit gern zum prior haben gehabt.»'' This is the often quoted version according to Veit Dietrich's copy; cf. also *Tischreden* i, no. 824 (p. 399); iii, no. 3011 (p. 140) and Aurifaber's translation (*Tischreden* i, no. 445 [p. 194f.]) with minor differences. Cf. moreover *Tischreden* i, no. 51 (p. 18); 252 (p. 106); no. 335 (p. 136); ii, no. 2620b (p. 550); iii, no. 2856 (p. 28); 2867b (p. 40); 3777 (p. 606f.); iv, no. 4029 (p. 313); 4441 (p. 313); 4625 (p. 408); 4873 (p. 565); v, no. 5316 (p. 56); 6305 (p. 592); 6317 (p. 600); 6412 (p. 649f.) and in general G. Ruhbach, Luthers Stellung zur alten Kirche, *Wort und Dienst* 10, 1969, 68ff.

[4] *W.A. Tischreden* i, no. 961 (p. 486): ''S. Hieronymus hat fur ein person gnug gethan. Nulla enim privata persona tantum efficere potuisset. Si unum atque alterum coniunxisset sibi, Spiritus Sanctus affuisset illis iuxta illud: Ubi duo vel tres etc. [Mt. 18,20]. Nec translatores debent esse soli, denn eim einigen fallen nicht allzeit gut et propria verba zu''; cf. *Tischreden* iii, no. 3271a (p. 243): ''Et Hieronimi translationem eis [sc. Septuaginta interpretibus] praeferimus, etiamsi confiteamur illum non recte sentire, qui Ieronimum einen guten Hebraeum schilt; er thut yhm gewalt'' and *ibid.* 3271b (p. 244).

[5] On this topic see the fundamental study of E.F. Rice, *Saint Jerome in the Renaissance*, Baltimore/London 1985; cf. also J.H. Bentley, *Humanists and Holy Writ. New Testament Scholarship in the Renaissance*, Princeton 1983; P.G. Bietenholz, Erasmus von Rotterdam und der Kult des Heiligen Hieronymus, *Poesis et pictura. Festschrift D. Wuttke*, Baden-Baden 1989, 191ff. and S. Garofalo, Gli umanisti italiani del secolo XV e la Bibbia, *La Bibbia e il Concilio di Trento*, Rome 1947, 44ff.

[6] On Jerome's representation in art see in addition to Rice (n. 5) *pass.* H. Friedmann, *A Bestiary for Saint Jerome. Animal Symbolism in European Religious Art*, Washington 1980; R. Jungblut, *Hieronymus. Darstellung und Verehrung eines Kirchenvaters*, Tübingen 1967; R. Miehe, Hieronymus, *Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie* vi, 1974, 519ff.; A. Pöhlmann, Von der Entwicklung des Hieronymus-Typus in der älteren Kunst, *Benediktinische Monatsschrift* 2, 1920, 438ff.; Chr. Wiebel, *Askese und Endlichkeitsdemut in der italienischen Renaissance*, Weinheim 1985. The engravings of A. Dürer are, among others, to be found in the catalogue of the exhibition *A. Dürer 1471-1971*, Nürnberg 1971, no. 273 fig. 156 and no. 151, fig. 90.

[7] Cf. Rebenich, *Hieronymus*, esp. 193ff.

[8] Cf. e.g. B. Fischer, *Das Neue Testament in lateinischer Sprache, ANTF* v, Berlin 1972, 1ff. (= id., *Beiträge zur Geschichte der lateinischen Bibeltexte*, Freiburg 1986, 156ff.); R. Loewe, The Medieval History of the Latin Vulgate, *The Cambridge History of the Bible* ii, Cambridge 1969, 102ff.; B. Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, Oxford

³1983; F. Stummer, *Einführung in die lateinische Bibel*, Paderborn 1928 and V. Reichmann, Bibelübersetzungen i.3: Übersetzungen ins Lateinische, in: *TRE* vi, 1980, 171ff. with further reading. For a general introduction see E. Würthwein, *Der Text des Alten Testaments*, Stuttgart ⁴1973.

[9] On the date of the commentaries see. P. Nautin, L'activite littéraire de Jérôme de 387 à 392, *RThPh* 115, 1983, 247ff.

[10] Hier. *vir.ill.* 135: "*novum testamentum graecae fidei reddidi*"; cf. Hier. *epp.* 71,5,3; 112,20,5.

[11] See the important article by F. Cavallera, Saint Jérôme et la Vulgate des Actes, des Epîtres et de l'Apocalypse, *BLE* 21, 1920, 269ff. and H.J. Frede, *Ein neuer Paulustext und Kommentar* i, Freiburg, 1973, 253ff.; on Jerome's translation of the Gospels see R.R. Harrison, *Jerome's Revision of the Gospels*, Ph.D. Diss. Univ. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 1986. For bibliography see V. Reichmann, Bibelübersetzungen i.3: Übersetzungen ins Lateinische, *TRE* vi, 1980, 171ff.

[12] For Rufinus and Jerome see Hier. *epp.* 51,2,4; 81,2 (on the identification see already D. Vallarsi, *PL* xxii, 736 note e). On Rufinus Syrus see F. Nuvolone, Pélage et Pélagianisme, *DSp* 12, 1986, 2890f. and G. Bonner, *Rufinus of Syria and African Pelagianism, AugStud* 1, 1970, 31ff.; E. Teselle, Rufinus the Syrian, Caelestius, Pelagius: Explorations in the Prehistory of the Pelagian Controversy, *AugStud* 3, 1972, 61ff.; O. Wermelinger, *Rom und Pelagius*, Stuttgart 1975, 12ff.—On the question if Rufinus Syrus is the author of the translation of the Pauline Epistles in the Vulgate-Recension see Fischer, *Beiträge* (n. 8) esp. 281ff.; H.J. Frede, *Vetus Latina* xxiv.2, Freiburg 1966-69, 40ff.; id., *Ein neuer Paulustext* ii, Freiburg 1974, 252ff.; W. Thiele, *Vetus Latina* xxvi.1, Freiburg 1969, 100*f.—On the *Liber de fide* see W. Dunphy, *The Liber de Fide of Rufinus the Syrian (?) and the Beginnings of the Pelagian Crisis*, Ph.D. Diss. Rome 1984 and id., Rufinus the Syrian's "Books", *Augustinianum* 23, 1983, 523ff.

[13] For a detailed discussion of the relationship between Jerome and Damasus see Rebenich, *Hieronymus* 141ff.

[14] Cf. Hier. *Vulg.Ps(G).* prol. (p. 767 Weber).

[15] Cf. Hier. *Vulg.Ps(H).* prol. (p. 768f. Weber).

[16] Cf. D. de Bruyne, Le problème du psautier romain, *RBen* 42, 1930, 101ff.; id., La reconstruction du psautier hexaplaire latin, *RBen* 41, 1929, 297ff.; A. Allgeier, Die erste Psalmenübersetzung des hl. Hieronymus und das Psalterium Romanum, *Biblica* 12, 1931, 447ff.; id., Die altlateinischen Psalterien. Prolegomena zu einer Textgeschichte der hieronymianischen Psalmübersetzungen, Freiburg 1928 and esp. C. Estin, *Les psautiers de Jérôme à la lumière des traductions juives antérieures,* Rome 1984 and Ch. Pietri, *Le monde latin antique et la Bible*, Rome 1985, 77ff.

[17] Cf. Hier. *comm. in Tit.* 3,9 (*Pl* xxvi, 630); Hier. *Comm.Ps.* 1,4 (*CCL* lxxii, 180); cf. also Hier. *vir.ill.* 3; 75; 113 and Hier. *Apol.* 3,12 (*CCL* lxxix, 84).

[18] Hier. *Vulg.Iob(G).* prol. (*PL* xxix, 63f.).

[19] Hier. *Vulg.Salom(G).* prol. (*PL* xxix, 425ff.); Hier. *Vulg.Par(G).* prol. (*ibid.* 423ff.).

[20] Cf. e.g. Hier. *Apol.* 3,25 (*CCL* lxxix, 97): "...[*Septuaginta editio*] *quam diligentissime emendatam ante annos plurimos meae linguae hominibus dedi...*"

[21] Cf. also Hier. *epp.* 71,5,3; 106,2,4; 134 (= Aug. *ep.* 172), 2,3; Hier. *Apol.* 2,24; (*CCL* lxxix, 61).

[22] Grützmacher ii 92ff.; but he claimed that the books of the Prophets too had been revised according to the Septuagint. For more detailed studies see for instance P. Benoît,

L'inspiration des Septante d'après les Pères, *Mélanges P.H. de Lubac* i, Paris 1964, 169ff.; J.H. Gailey, *Jerome's Latin Version of Job from the Greek. Chapters 1-26. Its Texts, Character and Provenance*, Ph.D. Diss. Princeton Univ. 1945; M. Johannessohn, Hieronymus und die jüngeren griechischen Übersetzungen des Alten Testamentes, *ThLZ* 73, 1948, 145ff.; id., Zur Entstehung der Ausdrucksweise der lateinischen Vulgata aus jüngeren griechischen alttestamentlichen Übersetzungen, *ZNTW* 54, 1952/53, 90ff.; O. Procksch, *Die Septuaginta Hieronymi im Dodekapropheton*, Greifswald 1914; A. Vaccari, Notulae patristicae II: S. Hieronymi in Canticum Canticorum curae hexaplares, *Gregorianum* 42, 1961, 728ff.; J. Ziegler, *Die jüngeren griechischen Übersetzungen als Vorlage der Vulgata in den prophetischen Schriften*, Braunsberg 1943/44; id., Die Septuaginta Hieronymi im Buch des Propheten Jeremias, *Colligere fragmenta. Festschrift A. Dold*, Beuron 1952, 13ff.

[23] On this date see P. Nautin, La date du "De viris illustribus" de Jérôme, de la mort de Cyrille de Jérusalem et de celle de Grégoire de Nazianze, *RHE* 56, 1961, 33ff.; cf. *id.*, Etudes de chronologie hiéronymienne, *REAug* 20, 1974, 280ff. T.D. Barnes, *Tertullian. A Historical and Literary Study*, Oxford 1971 (²1985) 4ff.; 235f., however, objects to Nautin's dating and insists that the work belongs in 392; cf. also A.D. Booth, Chronology of Jerome's Early Years, *Phoenix* 35, 1981, 241 n. 17; Kelly 174 n. 28.

[24] Hier. *vir.ill.* 135.

[25] Cf. Hier. *Vulg.Ios.* prol. (p. 285f. Weber) and Kelly 283f.

[26] See P. Jay, La datation des premières traductions de l'Ancien Testament sur l'hébreu par saint Jérôme, *REAug* 28, 1982, 208ff. P. Nautin, s.v. Hieronymus, *TRE* 15, 1986, 310 claims a different dating and order, but he does not adduce compelling arguments.

[27] Cf. e.g. *Vulg.Par(H).* prol. (p. 546 Weber): *"cur me non suscipiant Latini mei, qui inviolata editione veteri ita novam condidi, ut laborem meum Hebraeis et, quod maius est, Apostolis auctoribus probem?"*

[28] See Grützmacher ii 96ff.; Cavallera i 147ff.; Kelly 159ff.; 283ff.; A. Vaccari, Recupero d'un lavoro critico di S. Girolamo, *Scritti di erudizione e di filologia* ii, Rome 1958, 83ff.; W.H. Semple, St. Jerome as a Biblical Translator, *BRL* 48, 1965, 227ff.; H.F.D. Sparks, Jerome as Biblical Scholar, *The Cambridge History of the Bible* i, Cambridge 1970, 510ff.; F. Winkelmann, Einige Bemerkungen zu den Aussagen des Rufinus von Aquileia und des Hieronymus über ihre Übersetzungstheorie und -methode, *Festschrift J. Quasten* II, Münster 1970, 532ff.; G.J.M. Bartelink, Hieronymus over de vertaalproblematiek, *Hermeneus* 50, 1978, 105ff.; id., *Hieronymus. Liber de optimo genere interpretandi (Epistula 57). Ein Kommentar*, Leiden 1980, esp. 43ff.; C. Estin, Saint Jérôme, de la traduction inspirée à la traduction relativiste, *RBi* 88, 1981, 199ff. and most recently C.P. Bammel, Die Hexapla des Origenes: Die "hebraica veritas" im Streit der Meinungen, *Augustinianum* 28, 1988, 125ff.; R. Hennings, *Der Briefwechsel zwischen Augustinus und Hieronymus und ihr Streit um den Kanon des Alten Testaments und die Auslegung von Gal 2,11-14*, Ph.D. Diss. Heidelberg Univ. 1991, esp. 85ff. and M. Müller, Graeca sive hebraica veritas? Forsvaret for Septuaginta i Oldkirken, *Det gamle Testamente og den kristne fortolkning*, Kopenhagen 1988, 117ff. (= Graeca sive hebraica veritas? The Defence of the Septuagint in the Early Church, *SJOT* 1, 1989, 10ff.). Jerome's glory as a translator is perpetuated by the article of V. Larbaud, Le patron des traducteurs, *Commerce. Cahiers trimestriels* 21, 1929, 105ff., which A. Kolb has translated into German in 1956 (*Sankt Hieronymus. Schutzpatron der Übersetzer*). On the language of the Vulgate see G.Q.A. Meershoek, *Le Latin biblique d'après saint Jérôme.*

Aspects linguistiques de la rencontre entre la Bible et le monde classique, Nijmegen 1966.

[29] *CCL* lxxii, 1959, 59-116; cf. P. de Lagarde, *Onomastica sacra*, ²1887, 26-116.

[30] E. Klostermann, *Eusebius Werke* iii.1, 1904 (*GCS* xi.1); P. de Lagarde, *Onomastica sacra*, ²1887, 118-190.

[31] *CCL* lxxii, 1959, 1-56; cf. P. de Lagarde, 1868.

[32] Cavallera II 115-127 has a very useful, chronologically arranged, synopsis of Jerome's remarks on Origen.

[33] Cf. Rufin. *Apol. c. Hier.* 1,24 (*CCL* xx, 58).

[34] On this point see already A. Harnack, *Der kirchengeschichtliche Ertrag der exegetischen Arbeiten des Origenes* ii, *TU* 42, Leipzig 1919, 141ff. ("Origenistisches Gut in den Kommentaren des Hieronymus zum Philemon-, Galater-, Epheser- und Titusbrief"); cf. Grüzmacher ii 19ff.; Cavallera i 138ff.; Kelly 144ff.; A. Souter, *The Earliest Latin Commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul*, Oxford 1927, 96ff.; F. Deniau, Le Commentaire de Jérôme sur Ephésiens nous permet-il de connaître celui d'Origène?, *Origeniana, Quad. di VetChr* xii, Bari 1975, 163ff. with bibliography. See also M.A. Schatkin, The Influence of Origen upon St. Jerome's Commentary on Galatians, *VChr* 24, 1970, 49ff.

[35] Hier. *Apol.* 3,11 (*CCL* lxxix, 83): *"nos in commentariis et illis et aliis et nostram et aliorum sententias explicavimus, aperte confitentes quae sint haeretica, quae catholica. hic est enim commentariorum mos et explanantium regula, ut opiniones in expositione varias persequantur et quid vel sibi vel aliis videatur edisserant"*; cf. Hier. *epp.* 112 (= Aug. *ep.* 75), 5,2 and 119,1,4.

[36] Hier. *comm. in Mich.* prol. 2 (*CCL* lxxvi, 473): *"nam ... dicunt, Origenis me volumina compilare et contaminari non decere veterum scripta."*

[37] *Ibid.*: *"quod illi maledictum vehemens esse existimant, eandem laudem ego maximam duco, cum illum imitari volo, quem cunctis prudentibus ... placere non dubito."*

[38] Y.-M. Duval, *Le Livre du Jonas dans la littérature chrétienne grecque et latine. Source et influence du Commentaire sur Jonas de saint Jérôme*, 2 vols, Paris 1973 (quotation: i 302f.). See also id., *Jérôme. Commentaire sur Jonas, SCh* 323, Paris 1985, 74ff. On Jerome's commentaries on the Minor Prophets in general see Grützmacher ii 114ff.; M. Rahmer, *Die hebräischen Traditionen in den Werken des Hieronymus: Die commentarii zu den zwölf Kleinen Propheten*, Berlin 1902; on *comm. in Nahum*: Y.-M. Duval, Jérôme et Origène avant la querelle origèniste. La cure et la guérison ultime du monde et du diable dans l'In Nahum, *Augustinianum* 24, 1984, 471ff.; on *comm. in Ioel*: R. Reitzenstein, Origenes und Hieronymus, *ZNTW* 20, 1921, 90ff.

[39] Cf. Kelly 222ff. and E. Bonnard, *Saint Jérôme. Commentaire sur S. Matthieu* i, *SCh* 242, Paris 1972, 37f.

[40] Cf. M. Simonetti, Sulle fonti del Commento a Isaia di Girolamo, *Augustinianum* 24, 1984, 451ff. and esp. P. Jay, *L'exégèse de saint Jérôme d'après son Commentaire sur Isaïe*, Paris 1985.

[41] Grützmacher iii 199ff.

[42] Grützmacher iii 165ff.

[43] P. Jay, Jérôme à Bethléem: les "Tractatus in Psalmos", *Jérôme entre l'Occident et l'Orient*, Paris 1988, 367ff.

[44] See for instance C.P.H. Bammel, Philocalia IX, Jerome Epistle CXXI and Origen's Exposition of Romans VII, *JThS* 32, 1981, 50ff.; G. Bardy, Post apostolos ecclesiarum magister, *RMAL* 6, 1950, 313ff.; H. Chadwick, Origen, Celsus and the Resurrection of

the Body, *HThR* 41, 1948, 83ff.; P. Courcelle, *Les lettres grecques en Occident de Macrobe à Cassiodore*, Paris 1948, 87ff.; H. Crouzel, Jérôme traducteur du *Peri Archôn* d'Origène, *Jérôme entre l'Occident et l'Orient*, Paris 1988, 153ff.; Y.-M. Duval, Traces de lecture du *Peri Archôn* d'Origène avant le départ de Rome de Jérôme en 385..., *Jérôme entre l'Occident et l'Orient*, Paris 1988, 139ff.; P. Jay, Saint Jérôme et le triple sens de l'Ecriture, *REAug* 26, 1980, 214ff.; E. Klostermann, *Die Schriften des Origenes in Hieronymus' Brief an Paula, SB der Kgl. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.* 32, Berlin 1897, 855ff.; P. Nautin, Une citation méconnue des Stromates d'Origène, *Epektasis. Mélanges J. Daniélou*, Paris 1972, 373f.; I. Opelt, Origene visto da San Girolamo, *Augustinianum* 26, 1986, 217ff.

[45] Hier. *comm. in Os. prol.* (*CCL* lxxvi, 4f.); *comm. in Zach.* prol. 1 (*CCL* lxxvi.A, 748); *comm. in Mal.* prol. (*ibid.* 902).

[46] Didymus' commentary was edited, masterly prefaced and annotated by L. Doutreleau, *Didyme l'Aveugle. Sur Zacharie*, 3 vols. *SCh* 83-85, Paris 1962. In the first volume, p. 129ff., Doutreleau has analysed Jerome's dependence on Didymus.

[47] Already Grützmacher, in his discussions of some of Jerome's works, made important observations. See cf. also A. Penna, *Principi e carattere dell'esegesi di S. Girolamo*, Rome 1950, 1ff. ("Eclettismo") and, more recently, the articles on "Les maîtres de Jérôme" in the proceedings of the conference *Jérôme entre l'Occident et l'Orient. XVIe centenaire du départ de saint Jérôme de Rome et de son installation à Bethléem*, ed. by Y.-M. Duval, Paris 1988: P. Petitmengin, Saint Jérôme et Tertullien, 43ff.; S. Deléani, Présence de Cyprien dans les oeuvres de Jérôme sur la virginité, 61ff.; M. Dulaey, Jérôme, Victorin de Poetovio et le millénarisme, 83ff.; M. Perrin, Jérôme lecteur de Lactance, 99ff.; J.-M. Matthieu, Grégoire de Nazianze et Jérôme: Commentaire de l'*In Ephesios* 3,5,32, 115ff.; C. Moreschini, *Praeceptor meus.* Tracce dell'insegnamento di Gregorio Nazianzeno in Gerolamo, 129ff. Jerome's dependence on preceding Christian exegetes is also recognizable from the instructive *Indices scriptorum* in the edition of his commentaries in *Corpus Christianorum.* However, it should be noted that Jerome also quoted second-hand; in this connection, Jerome's remarks on the Jewish-Christian sect of the Nazoraeans are revealing; see A. Schmidtke, *Neue Fragmente und Untersuchungen zu den judenchristlichen Evangelien: Ein Beitrag zur Literatur und Geschichte der Judenchristen, TU* 37.1. Leipzig 1911, esp. 64f.; 120ff., 246ff. and G. Bardy, Saint Jérôme et l'évangile selon les Hébreux, *Mélanges de sciences réligieuses* 3, 1946, 5ff.; W. Kinzig, "Non-Separation": Closeness and Co-operation between Jews and Christians in the Fourth Century, *VChr* 45, 1991, 27ff.; A.F.J. Klijn, Jerome's Quotations from a Nazoraean Interpretation of Isaiah, *RSR* 60, 1972, 241ff.; id.; G.J. Reinink, *Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects, NT.S* xxxvi, Leiden 1973; R.A. Pritz, *Nazarene Jewish Christianity: From the End of the New Testament Period until its Disappearance in the Fourth Century, Studia Post-Biblica* xxxvii, Jerusalem/Leiden 1988.

[48] Hier. *ep.* 22,35,8.

[49] Courcelle, Lettres grecques (n. 44) 37ff., esp. 64ff.; 83ff.; 91ff. Cf. also W.C. McDermott, St. Jerome and Pagan Greek Literature, *VChr* 36, 1982, 372ff.; A. Luebeck, *Hieronymus quos noverit scriptores et ex quibus hauserit,* Leipzig 1872 and K.A. Neuhausen, Hieronymus, Seneca und Theophrasts Schrift über die Freundschaft, *Vivarium. Festschrift Th. Klauser*, Münster 1984, 257ff.

[50] Rufin. *Apol. c. Hier.* 2,7 (*CCL* xx, 88).

[51] Hier. *Apol.* 3,39 (*CCL* lxxix, 108): *"de dogmatibus eorum* [sc. Pythagoras, Plato, and

Empedocles], *non libris locutus sum, quae potui in Cicerone, Bruto ac Seneca discere.*"

[52] Duval, Le Livre de Jonas (n. 38), esp. II 493ff.

[53] It may only be referred to the Greek secular historian Zosimos who, in his *Historia Nea*, written about 500, also pretended a wide reading, cf. e.g. 1,47,1; 2,36,2; 54,2; 3,2,4; 4,18,4; 5,27,1f.; 29,3.

[54] During the Middle Ages, Jerome's translation had been called *nostra translatio, nostra usitata editio* or *ea translatio qua nostrae ecclesiae passim utuntur*; cf. e.g. A. Allgeier, Haec vetus et vulgata editio, *Biblica* 29, 1948, 353ff.; E.F. Sutcliffe, The Name "Vulgate", *Biblica* 29, 1948, 345ff.; id., The Council of Trent and the "Authentica" of the Vulgate, *JThS* 49, 1948, 35ff.

[55] See Jerome's pointed remark in *Apol.* 3,6 (*CCL* lxxix, 79): *"ego ... hebraeus, graecus, latinus, trilinguis?"*

[56] Cf. Hier. *ep.* 17,2.

[57] E.g. Hier. *Vulg.Tb.* prol. (p. 676 Weber); *Vulg.Iud.* prol. (*ibid.* 691); *Vulg.Iob(H).* prol. (*ibid.* 731); *Vulg.Dan.* prol. (*ibid.* 1341); cf. also Hier. *ep.* 18A,10; *comm. in Dan.* 1,2,4 (*CCL* lxxv.A, 785); 1,4,5 (*ibid.* 812) and M. Rahmer, *Die hebräischen Traditionen in den Werken des Hieronymus i: Die Quaestiones in Genesim*, Breslau 1861, 10f.

[58] Perhaps with the exception of his friend Epiphanius of Salamis, the so-called πεντάγλωσσος, who was said to know the Greek, the Syrian, the Hebrew, the Coptic, and the rudiments of the Latin language (cf. Hier. *Apol.* 2,22; 3,6 [*CCL* lxxix, 58; 79]). But J. Dummer, Die Sprachkenntnisse des Epiphanius, in F. Altheim and R. Stiehl (edd), *Die Araber in der alten Welt* v.1, Berlin 1968, 392ff. and W. Schneemelcher, s.v. Epiphanius, *RAC* v, 1962, 910, have doubted that Epiphanius knew five languages.

[59] Cf. e.g. Aug. *civ.* 18,42: *"quamvis non defuerit temporibus nostris presbyter, homo doctissimus et omnium trium linguarum peritus, qui non ex Graeco, sed ex Hebraeo in Latinum eloquium easdem scripturas convertit"*; Aug. *Contra Iulianum* 1,7,34 (*PL* xliv, 665): *"nec sanctum Hieronymum, quia presbyter fuit, contemnendum arbitreris, qui Graeco et Latino insuper et Hebraeo eruditus eloquio ex occidentali ad orientalem transiens ecclesiam, in locis sanctis atque in litteris sacris usque ad decrepitam vixit aetatem"*; Sulp.Sev. *Dial.* 1,8,3: *"vir [sc. Hieronymus] enim praeter fidei meritum dotemque virtutum non solum Latinis adque Graecis, sed et Hebraeis litteris ita institutus est, ut se illi in omni scientia nemo audeat conparare."* See also the useful collection of *testimonia* in *PL* xxii, 213ff. (on the earlier evidence cf. M.L.W. Laistner, St. Jerome in the Early Middle Ages, *A Monument to St. Jerome*, New York 1952, 235ff.). Worth mentioning is the earliest preserved *vita* of Jerome, *Hieronymus noster*; there we find: *"Christi itaque gratia Hieronymus fidem adeptus, litterisque Graecis ac Latinis atque Hebraicis doctus, cuncta Hebraeorum volumina, quae in canone continentur, ex veteri testamento, vera editione in linguam Latinam vertit, eaque omnia commentatus est"* (*PL* xxii, 182). Jerome's knowledge of Syriac and Aramaic is also often emphasized, cf. e.g. the *Vita Sancti Hieronymi* of N. Maniacoria (or Maniacutia), *PL* xxii, 187: *"quid vero de huius viri indefesso studio et eleganti industria, quam circa Graecos, Latinos, Hebraeos, Syros et Chaldaeos exhibuit in discendo, aliud nihil dici potest praestantius, quam quod ipsius ad Pammachium et Oceanum missa profitentur verba dicentis? [sc. ep.* 84,3]." The fact that Arabic too is sometimes mentioned (cf. e.g. the Vita *Plerosque nimirum*, ed. B. Mombritius, *Sanctuarium seu vitae sanctorum* ii, Paris 1910, 31) may be explained by Jerome's allusions to the *arabicus sermo* and the *arabica lingua*, cf. e.g. Hier. *Vulg.Iob(H).* prol. (p. 731 Weber); *Vulg.Dan.* prol. (*ibid.* 1341).

[60]Cf. Rice (n. 5), 173ff. (chapter 7: "The Translator of the Vulgate Bible: A Sixteenth-Century Controversy") and W. Schwartz, *Principles and Problems of Biblical Translations. Some Reformation Controversies and their Background*, Cambridge 1955 with bibliography. Already Nicola Maniacoria (or Maniacutia), deacon of the Roman Church *S. Lorenzo in Damaso* in the twelfth century and author of a *vita* of Jerome (*PL* xxii, 183-202), after learning Hebrew from a Jewish scholar, realized differences between the *Psalterium iuxta hebraeos* and the Hebrew original; see V. Peri, Nicola Maniacutia: un testimone della filologia romana nel XII secolo, *Aevum* 41, 1967, 67ff. Other mediaeval theologians who, like Nicholas of Lyra of Raymundus Martinus, were able to read Hebrew, discovered misrenderings in Jerome's translations, cf. RICE (n. 5), 175. Rabbis, especially from Spain, also examined the reliability of Jerome's translations and criticized quite a few passages, see already Rahmer (n. 57), 13.

[61] The edition is to be found in the second volume of Montfaucon's *Collectio nova patrum et scriptorum graecorum* (1706), 347-593 (= *PG* xxiv, 89-520); cf. *PG* xxiv, 88: *"Et, quod observes velim, ubicumque Eusebius se ab Hebraeo doctore vel ab Hebraeis aliquid edidicisse ait, ibidem Hieronymus se idipsum ab Hebraeo doctore accepisse testificatur."* On this edition see R. Devreesse, L'édition du commentaire d'Eusèbe de Césarée sur Isaïe, *RBi* 42, 1933, 540ff.

[62] G. Bardy, Saint Jérôme et ses maîtres hébreux, *RBen* 46, 1934, 145ff. quotation: p. 164); see already A. Harnack, *Der kirchengeschichtliche Ertrag der exegetischen Arbeiten des Eusebius, TU* 42, Leipzig 1919, 141ff.

[63] Cf. P. Nautin, *Origène* i, Paris 1977, esp. 214ff.; 284ff.; 326ff.; 344ff.; 359ff.

[64] P. Nautin, s.v. Hieronymus, *TRE* 15, 1986, 310: "Sobald er sich jedoch von den Quellen entfernt, ist alles reine Erfindung." Already Schmidtke (n. 47), 123, on Jerome's remarks on the Nazoraeans, has assumed: "Denn Hieronymus bietet, wo er sonst über Epiphanius bzw. dessen Quelle [i.e. the commentary on Isaiah written by Apollinaris of Laodicea] hinausgeht, nachweislich nur nichtige Fabeleien."

[65] Nautin, *TRE* 15, 309f. and 311.

[66] L. Ginzberg, *Die Haggada bei den Kirchenvätern vi: Der Kommentar des Hieronymus zu Jesaja*, New York 1935; Simonetti, Commento a Isaia (n. 40); cf., moreover, Jay, *L'exégèse de saint Jérôme* (n. 40) and B. Löfstedt, Zu Hieronymus' Jesaias-Kommentar, *Orpheus* 5, 1984, 197ff.

[67] C.T.R. Hayward, Jewish Traditions in Jerome's Commentary on Jeremiah and the Targum of Jeremiah, *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 9, 1985, 100ff.; cf. id., St. Jerome and the Aramaic Targum, *JSSt* 32, 1987, 105ff.

[68] J. Bravermann, *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel. A Study of Comparative Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Hebrew Bible*, Washington 1978; J. Smeets, Traditions juives dans la Vulgate de Daniel et le commentaire de Jérôme, *Service international de documentation judéo-chrétienne* xii.2, Rome 1979, 16ff.

[69] Duval, *Le Livre de Jonas* (n. 38), 1973.

[70] Rahmer (n. 57); M.J. Lagrange, Saint Jérôme et la tradition juive dans la Genèse, *RBi* 7, 1898, 563ff. and most recently A. Kamesar, *Studies in Jerome's Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim: The Work as Seen in the Context of Greek Scholarship*, Ph.D. Diss. Oxford Univ. 1987.

[71] Kamesar, *Studies* (n. 70), esp. 96ff.; 115ff.; 120ff.; 129ff. See also id., The Virgin of Isaiah 7:14: the Philological Argument from the Second to the Fifth Century, *JThS* 41, 1990, 51ff. and Jay, *L'exégèse de saint Jérôme* (n. 40), 39: "Pour être à même de remonter

aux textes originaux de l'Ancien Testament, Jérôme n'avait pas hésité en effet à aller chercher auprès de juifs compétents une connaissance non seulement de la langue mais des traditions hébraïques." On Origen and the Hebrew Bible see, for instance, G. Sgherri, A proposito di Origene e la lingua ebraica, *Augustinianum* 14, 1974, 223ff.

[72] Cf. A. Condamin, L'influence de la tradition juive dans la version de s. Jérôme, *RSR* 5, 1914, 1ff.; R. Hennings, Rabbinisches und Antijüdisches bei Hieronymus, Ep. 121,10; forthcoming in J. van Oort u. U. Wickert (edd.), *Christliche Exegese zwischen Nicaea und Chalcedon*, Kampen 1992; F. Vattoni, Saggio sulla Volgata dei Proverbi, *VetChr* 3, 1966, 143ff.

[73] Cf. e.g. W. Bacher, Eine angebliche Lücke im hebräischen Wissen des Hieronymus, *ZATW* 22, 1902, 114ff.; J. Barr, St. Jerome's Appreciation of Hebrew, *BRL* 49, 1967, 281ff. (reprinted Manchester 1967); E. Brønno, *Die Aussprache der hebräischen Laryngale nach Zeugnissen des Hieronymus*, Aarhus 1970; R.G.J. Elliot, Hebrew Learning Among the Fathers, *DictChristBiogr* 2, 1880, 864ff.; H. Kaupel, Beobachtungen zur Wiedergabe des infinitivus absolutus in der Vulgata des Buches Leviticus, *Biblica* 22, 1941, 252ff.; B. Kedar-Kopfstein, Die Wiedergabe des hebräischen Kausativs in der Vulgata, *ZATW* 85, 1973, 196ff.; R. Loewe, Jerome's Rendering of zwlm, *Hebrew Union College Annuals* 22, 1949, 265ff.; id., Jerome's Treatment of an Anthropopathism, *VT* 2, 1952, 261ff.; M. Rehm, Die Bedeutung hebräischer Wörter bei Hieronymus, *Biblica* 35, 1954, 174ff.; F. Stummer, Einige Beobachtungen über die Arbeitsweise des Hieronymus bei der Übersetzung des Alten Testamentes aus der hebraica veritas, *Biblica* 10, 1929, 1ff.; id., Beiträge zur Lexikographie der lateinischen Bibel, *Biblica* 18, 1937, 25ff.; E.F. Sutcliffe, St. Jerome's Hebrew Manuscripts, *Biblica* 29, 1948, 195ff.

[74] E. Burstein, La compétence de Jérôme en hébreu. Explication de certaines erreurs, *REAug* 21, 1975, 3ff.; esp. p. 12: "La compétence linguistique [sc. de Jérôme] ne se mesure pas avec précision; et faire passer l'oeuvre hiéronymienne au crible des critères de la philologie moderne serait aussi absurde que vain. Néanmoins on peut, nous semble-t-il, établir pour Jérôme une distinction entre ce que nous proposons d'appeler compétence «active» et connaissance «passive». Jérôme, de toute évidence, était capable de lire et reconnaître les formes hébraïques; il lisait l'Ecriture avec une aisance et une célérité qui étonnaient ces contemporains." E. Burstein's thesis, *La compétence du hébreu de saint Jérôme*, Poitiers 1971, has not been accessible to me. On the question of Jerome's linguistic competence see already Grützmacher ii 107ff.

[75] Hier. *comm. in Ion.* 4,6 (*SCh* 323, 296ff.): *"in hoc loco quidam Canterius, de antiquissimo genere Corneliorum, sive, ut ipse iactat, de stirpe Asinii Pollionis, dudum Romae dicitur me accusasse sacrilegii quod pro cucurbita hederam transtulerim. timuit videlicet ne, si pro cucurbitis hederae nascerentur, unde occulte et tenebrose biberet non haberet. et revera, in ipsis cucurbitis vasculorum quas vulgo saucomarias vocant, solent apostolorum imagines adumbrari e quibus et ille sibi non suum nomen adsumpsit. quod si tam facile vocabula commutantur ut pro Corneliis seditiosis tribunis Aemilii consules appellentur, miror cur mihi non liceat hederam transferre pro cucurbita."* Cf. also Y.-M. Duval, *Jérôme. Commentaire sur Jonas, SCh* 323, Paris 1985, 419ff. and P. Hamblenne, Relectures de philologue sur le scandale du lierre/ricin (Hier. In Ion. 4,6), *Euphrosyne* 16, 1988, 183ff.

[76] Cf. Hier. *comm. in Ion.* 4,6 (*SCh* 323, 298ff.) and *Duval, op. cit.* (n. 75) 421ff. The plant called קיקיון, however, is still not positively identified; perhaps it refers to the plant *ricinus*; cf. e.g. I. Löw, *Die Flora der Juden* i, Leipzig 1924, 608ff. and W. Rudolph, *Kommentar zum Alten Testament* xiii.2, Gütersloh 1971, 361.

[77] On the Republican genealogies of the Roman senatorial aristocracy see Rebenich, *Hieronymus* 181ff.

[78] Rufin. *Apol. c. Hier.* 2,39 (*CCL* xx, 114): *"posteaquam senuit mundus et cuncta perurguentur ad finem, scribamus etiam in sepulchris veterum, ut sciant et ipsi qui hic aliter legerant, quia Ionas non habuit umbram cucurbitae sed hederae; et iterum, cum voluerit legislator, nec hederae sed alterius virgulti."* It may be worth reminding that this *motif* of the Jonah-cycle was quite often depicted on early Christian *sarcophagi*; cf. e.g. *Spätantike und Frühes Christentum*, Katalog der Ausstellung im Liebighaus, Frankfurt/M 1983, 241ff. with bibliography.

[79] Hier. *Apol.* 1,30 (*CCL* lxxix, 29): *"sin autem contra invidos loquor et Luscium Lanuinum vel Asinium Pollionem de genere Corneliorum stili mei mucro convulnerat, si hystriculae et lividae mentis hominem a me submoveo et ad unum stipitem cuncta iacula dirigo, quid vulnera sua partitur in multos...?"*

[80] Hier. *ep.* 104 (= Aug. *ep.* 71), 5; in general see Y.-M. Duval, Saint Augustin et le Commentaire sur Jonas de saint Jérôme, *REAug* 12, 1966, 9ff.

[81] Hier. *ep.* 112 (= Aug. *ep.* 75), 22,1-3: *"dicis me in Iona propheta male quiddam interpretatum et seditione populi conclamante propter unius verbi dissonantiam episcopum paene sacerdotium perdidisse. et quid sit illud, quod male interpretatus sim, subtrahis auferens mihi occasionem defensionis meae, ne, quicquid dixeris, me respondente solvatur, nisi forte ut ante annos plurimos cucurbita venit in medium adserente illius temporis Cornelio et Asinio Pollione me «hederam» pro «cucurbita» transtulisse ... hoc ergo verbum de verbo edisserens si «ciceion» transferre voluissem, nullus intellegeret, si «cucurbita», id dicerem, quod in Hebraico non habetur; «hederam» posui, ut ceteris interpretibus consentirem. sin autem Iudaei vestri, ut ipse adseris, malitia vel inperitia hoc dixerunt esse in voluminibus Hebraeorum, quod in Graecis et Latinis codicibus continetur, manifestum est eos aut Hebraeas litteras ignorare aut ad inridendos cucurbitarios voluisse mentiri."*

[82] On this question see Rebenich, *Hieronymus*, pass.

[83] Cf. also Hier. *comm. in Dan.* 2,5,7c (*CCL* lxxv.A, 823f.), where he sharply refutes any criticism of his translation. On the other hand, he is, if necessary, prepared to correct his translation, see e.g. Hier. *comm. in Zach.* 3,11,12-13 (*CCL* lxxvi.A, 857).

[84] Hier. *ep.* 112 (= Aug. *ep.* 75), 20,5: *"sicubi dubitas, Hebraeos interroga"*, and *ibid.* 21,1: *"dices: «quid, si Hebraei aut respondere noluerint aut mentire voluerint?» tota frequentia Iudaeorum in mea interpretatione reticebit? nullus inveniri poterit, qui Hebraeae linguae habeat notitiam, aut omnes imitabuntur illos Iudaeos, quos dicis in Africae repertos oppidulo in meam calumniam conspirasse?"* Cf., moreover, Hier. *Vulg.Par(G).* prol. (*PL* xxix, 426): *"si quis in hac interpretatione voluerit aliquid reprehendere, interroget Hebraeos..."; Vulg.Pent.* prol. (p. 4 Weber): *"sicubi tibi [sc. Desiderio] in translatione videor errare, interroga Hebraeos, diversarum urbium magistros consule: quod illi habent de Christo, tui codices non habent"* and *Vulg.Esr.* prol. (*ibid.* 638): *"interrogent Hebraeos et ipsis auctoribus translationi meae vel adrogent vel derogent fidem."* All these passages confidently counter criticism of his translations from the Hebrew; at the same time they show that in Rome and other cities of the Empire Jewish scholars could be found who offered their assistance in tackling difficult textual problems.

[85] Cf. Rufin. *Apol. c. Hier.* 1,22-44; 2,13-22; 2,28 (*CCL* xx, 56ff.; 93ff.; 103f.).

[86] *Ibid.* 2,6f. (*ibid.* 87ff.). On Jerome's oath see Rebenich, *Hieronymus* 35ff.

[87] Cf. Hier. *Apo.* 3,11 (*CCL* lxxix, 83).

[88] Hier. *ep.* 84,3,1f.: *"dum essem iuvenis, miro discendi ferebar ardore nec iuxta quorundam praesumptionem ipse me docui ... rursum Hierosolymae et Bethleem quo labore, quo pretio Baraninam nocturnum habui praeceptorem! timebat enim Iudaeos et mihi alterum exhibebat Nicodemum. horum omnium frequenter in opusculis meis facio mentionem."*

[89] Rufin. *Apol. c. Hier.* 2,15 (*CCL* xx, 94): *"Illud autem minimum quidem est et responsione vix dignum, quod numerans doctores suos, quos se de synagoga dicit esse mercatum, stimulans nos subiungit: neque enim—inquit—ipse me docui, sicut quidam, nos sine dubio intuens, in quos omne ab initio lacerationis suae pondus invexit."*

[90] *Ibid.* (*ibid.* 95): *"non propter istos dicit quia ipsi nos docuimus, sed quia Barabban eius de synagoga magistrum non suscepimus et quia per* Εἰσαγωγήν *Porphyrii ad logicam non sumus introducti. ignosce mihi pro hoc quod malui ante inperitus et indoctus audire, quam Barabbae discipulus dici. proposito etenim Christo simul et Barabba, ego quasi inperitus Christum elegi; tu, ut video, cum illis clamas, qui dicunt: «Non hunc sed Barraban»* [cf. 2 *Cor.* 3,6]*... ille vero de synagoga Barabbas tuus, pro Christo electus, docuit te resurrectionem carnis non in virtute sed in fragilitate sperare..."*

[91] Hier. *Apol.* 1,13 (*CCL* lxxix, 12): *"audio praeterea te quaedam de epistola mea, philosophe, carpere et hominem rugosae frontis adductique supercilii, Plautino in me sale ludere, eo quod Barraban Iudaeum dixerim praeceptorem meum. nec mirum si pro Baranina, ubi est aliqua vocabulorum similitudo, scripseris Barraban, cum tantam habeas licentiam nominum mutandorum, ut de Eusebio Pamphilum, de haeretico martyrem feceris... ego non illum magistrum dixi, sed meum in scripturas sanctas studium volui conprobare, ut ostenderem me sic Origenem legisse, quomodo et illum audieram."*

[92] Hier. *Apol.* 3,6 (*CCL* lxxix, 79): *"ego philosophus, rhetor, grammaticus, dialecticus, hebraeus, graecus, trilinguis? hoc modo et tu bilinguis eris, quia tantam habes graeci latinique sermonis scientiam, ut et Graeci te latinum et Latini graecum putent..."*

[93] In general see M. Simon, *Verus Israel. Etude sur les relations entre chrétiens et juifs dans l'Empire romain (135-425)*, Paris [2]1964 and J. Van Amersfoort, J. Van Oort (edd), *Juden und Christen in der Antike*, Kampen 1990; J.R. Baskin, Rabbinic-Patristic Exegetical Contacts in Late Antiquity: A Bibliographical Reappraisal, in W.S. Green (ed), *Approaches to Ancient Judaism* v, Atlanta 1985, 53ff.; Kinzig (n. 47) 27ff.; L.I. Levine, *The Rabbinic Class of Roman Palestine in Late Antiquity*, Jerusalem/New York 1989. L. Cracco-Ruggini, Il vescovo Cromazio e gli ebrei di Aquileia, *AAAd* 12, 1977, 353ff. is a stimulating analysis of Jewish-Christian contacts in Aquileia.

[94] Hier. *Vulg.Ps(H).* prol. (p. 768 Weber). Cf. also Hier. *ep.* 104 (= Aug. *ep.* 71), 4,2: *"huc accedit, quia etiam consulti Hebraei possunt aliud respondere, ut tu solus necessarius videaris, qui etiam ipsos possis convincere, sed tamen, quo iudice, mirum si potueris invenire."*

[95] Rahmer (n. 57), 8 and n. 4 renders the Latin name Baranina as Bar Chanina (חנינא בר) and assures that in Jerome's time some Jewish scholars (*Haggadisten*) were known as Bar Chanina. But Rahmer's hypothetical identification of Baranina with a teacher from Lydda is not conclusive since he connects Jerome's allusions to various *Hebraei* with this person. On Jerome's Hebrew teachers see also I. Opelt, S. Girolamo ed i suoi maestri ebrei, *Augustinianum* 28, 1988, 327ff.; her identification of five Jewish *maestri*, however, is not based upon an anylysis of all relevant passages. Cf., moreover, S. Krauss, The Jews in the Works of the Church Fathers vi: Jerome, *JQR* 6, 1894, 225ff. and J. Schwartz, Jerome and the Jews of Judaea [Hebrew with English summary], *Zion* (Jerusalem) 47, 1982, 186ff.

[96] Cf. e.g. Hier. *epp.* 36,1,1f.; 72,4,3; 125,12,1; *Vulg.Tb.* prol. (p. 576 Weber); *Vulg.Iob(H).* prol. (*ibid.* 731); *Vulg.Dan.* prol. (*ibid.* 1341f.); *comm. in Eccles.* 4,13 (*CCL* lxxii, 288f.); *comm. in Am.* 1,3,11 (*CCL* lxxvi, 250); *comm. in Nah.* 1,9 (*CCL* lxxvi.A, 535); *comm. in Abd.* 1,2,15-17 (*ibid.* 610); *comm. in Zach.* 3,14,10-11 (*ibid.* 885ff.); *comm. in Mal.* 2,13-16 (*ibid.* 924); *comm. in Tit.* 3,9 (*PL* xxvi, 595f.). The references Bardy [n. 62] has positively assigned to Greek sources are omitted. See also Duval, *Jérôme. Commentaire sur Jonas* (n. 75), 72f. and the index p. 444f. s.vv. *Hebraei / Hebraeum / Hebraeus / Hebraicum / Hebraicus.*

[97] Opelt (n. 95), 338 has come to the same conclusion (*pace* Pierre Nautin): "Ad ogni modo Girolamo ricercando il testo originale, fece un passo, un grande passo avanti, nell'incontro con gli ebrei."

[98] Cf. e.g. Hier. *ep.* 125,12,1; *comm. in Tit.* 3,9 (*PL* xxvi, 630) and J. Barr, St. Jerome and the Sound of Hebrew, *JSSt* 12, 1967, 1ff.; C. Siegfried, Die Aussprache des Hebräischen bei Hieronymus, *ZATW* 4, 1884, 34ff.; E.F. Sutcliffe, St. Jerome's Pronunciation of Hebrew, *Biblica* 29, 1948, 112ff.

[99] Hier. *Vulg.Dan.* prol. (p. 1341 Weber): *"usque ad praesentem diem magis possum sermonem chaldeum legere et intellegere quam sonare."*

[100] Hier. *ep.* 84,3,2.

[101] Hier. *Vulg.Iob(H).* prol. (p. 731 Weber): *"memini me ob intellegentiam huius voluminis Lyddeum quemdam praeceptorem qui apud Hebraeos primas habere putabatur, non parvis redemisse nummis."*

[102] Hier. *Vulg.Dan.* prol. (p. 1341 Weber).

[103] Hier. *Vulg.Par(G).* prol. (*PL* xxix, 423). As to various manuscript readings cf. *PL* xxvi, 424 note 5.

[104] Cf. also Theodor of Mopsuestia's work "Πρὸς τοὺς λέγοντας φύσει καὶ οὐ γνώμῃ πταίειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους", summarized by Photius in his *bibliotheca*; there, Jerome's translation of the Old Testament according to the *hebraica veritas* is characterized as follows: "καὶ ἀπώσασθαι μὲν τῆς θείας καὶ παλαιᾶς γραφῆς ἣν οἱ ἑβδομήκοντα συνεληλυθότες ἐκδεδώκασι μετάφρασιν, καὶ δὴ καὶ τὴν Συμμάχου καὶ Ἀκύλα καὶ τῶν ἄλλων, ἰδίαν δέ τινα καὶ καινὴν ἐπαρθῆναι συντάξαι μήτε τὸν τῆς θείας γραφῆς νοῦν ἐκδιδαχθέντα, Ἑβραίων δέ τισι τῶν χαμαιπετῶν ἑαυτὸν ἐκδεδωκότα ἐκεῖθεν θαρρῆσαι ἰδίαν ἔκδοσιν ἀναγράφειν." On this work see *CPG* ii 3860; Cavallera ii 115 and H. Kihn, *Theodor von Mopsuestia und Junilius Africanus als Exegeten*, Freiburg 1880, esp. 90f.

[105] The charge of having Judaized the word of God was a common polemical feature among Christian writers which Jerome also used; see, for instance, his criticism of *iudaizantes Christiani* in *comm. in Is.* 4,11,6/9 (CCL 73, 150f.); cf. V. Buchheit, Tierfriede bei Hieronymus und seinen Vorgängern, *JbAC* 33, 1990, 21ff., esp. 29ff. Cass. *inst.* praef. criticized the (Nestorian) school of Nisibis as an institution controlled by "Hebrews" and reflected the contemporary defamation of the Nestorians as "philo-Semites" (on the academy in Nisibis see E. Nestle, Die Statuten der Schule von Nisibis aus dem Jahre 496 und 590, *ZKG* 18, 1898, 211ff.). For the theological background in general see H. Schreckenberg, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld (1.-11. Jahrhundert)*, Frankfurt/M [2]1990.

[106] Rufin. *Apol. c. Hier.* 2,41 (*CCL* xx, 115): *"tuum igitur, frater, tuum est factum, nec quemquam te in hoc comitem vel socium habuisse de ecclesia certum est, nisi istum solum quem frequenter commemorabas, Barraban. quis enim alius auderet ab apostolis tradita ecclesiae instrumenta temerare, nisi Iudaicus spiritus? illi te, o mi frater antequam a*

Iudaeis carpereris carissime, illi te in haec mala praecipitant..." This passage and *ep.* 84,3,2 make it plain that Jerome mentioned Baranina as authority in other works which have obviously not survived.

[107] Hier. *Apol.* 2,24 (*CCL* lxxix, 61): "*egone contra Septuaginta interpretes aliquid sum locutus, quos ante annos plurimos diligentissime emendatos meae linguae studiosis dedi, quos cottidie in conventu fratrum edissero, quorum psalmos iugi meditatione decanto? tam stultus eram, ut, quod in pueritia didici, senex oblivisci vellem? universi tractatus mei horum testimoniis texti sunt.*" Cf. *ibid.* 2,35 (*ibid.* 72): "*ex quibus omnibus approbatur, et Septuaginta interpretum editionem, quae legentium vetustate firmata est, utilem esse ecclesiis, dum ante gentes audiunt Christum venturum esse quam veniat, et ceteros interpretes non reprobandos, qui non sua sed divina volumina transtulerunt...*"

[108] Hier. *Apol.* 2,24 (*CCL* lxxix, 60).

[109] Cf. Rebenich, *Hieronymus* 195ff.

[110] Hier. *comm. in Eccles.* prol. (*CCL* lxxii, 249): "*sed de Hebraeo transferens, magis me Septuaginta interpretum consuetudini coaptavi, in his dumtaxat, quae non multum ab Hebraicis discrepabant.*"

[111] Hier. *ep.* 106. On the date see B. Altaner, Wann schrieb Hieronymus seine ep. 106 ad Sunniam et Fretelam de Psalterio?, *VChr* 4, 1950, 246ff. The hypothesis of D. de Bruyne, La lettre de Jérôme à Sunnia et Fretela sur le Psautier, *ZNTW* 28, 1929, 1ff. that the letter 106 is fictional was rejected by A. Allgeier, Der Brief an Sunnia und Fretela und seine Bedeutung für die Textherstellung der Vulgata, *Biblica* 11, 1930, 86ff.; id., *Die Psalmen der Vulgata*, Paderborn 1940, 63ff.; J. Zeiller, La lettre de Jérôme aux Goths Sunnia et Fretela, *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres* 1935, 228ff.; cf. also id., Saint Jérôme et les Goths, *Miscellanea Hieronymiana*, Rome 1920, 123ff.

[112] See especially his prefaces to the books of the Old Testament and *epistula* 57. See also Bammel (n. 28) 143ff. and Kamesar, Studies (n. 70), esp. 30ff. On Jerome's criticism of the Septuagint in later commentaries cf. e.g. Hier. *comm. in Hier.* 4,38,5 (*CSEL* lix, 361f.); 4,38,9 (*ibid.* 262f.); 4,43,2.4 (*ibid.* 269f.); 4,45,2.4 (*ibid.* 273f.); 5,66,4 (*ibid.* 357); 6,7,6 (*ibid.* 374).

Universität Mannheim, Historisches Institut
6800 *Mannheim* 1, Schloss

Vigiliae Christianae 47 (1993), 78-84, E.J. Brill, Leiden

A HISTORICAL SOURCE OF THE PASSIO TYPASII

BY

DAVID WOODS

The *Passio Typasii* has survived in only one manuscript, and was published for the first time in 1890.[1] According to this work Typasius was a soldier in Mauretania who refused to accept a donative from the emperor Maximianus when he was preparing his forces there to campaign against the rebellious Quinquegentiani. However Typasius did promise victory for Maximianus, and even for Diocletian in the East, if he should release him to serve Christ instead. When these victories came to pass Maximianus had Typasius honourably discharged from the army. Several years later, though, during the general persecution of christians, attempts were made to re-enlist Typasius within the army. These ended with his death.

Such in brief is the tale which has survived concerning Typasius. Although there is no doubt because of the inscriptional evidence that there existed an early cult of a Mauretanian martyr by the name of Typasius there has been some controversy over the authority of the *Passio* as it has come down to us.[2] It is generally accepted that the *Passio Typasii* is "le résultat d'un singulier amalgame d'Actes authentiques, de digressions historiques, et de pures légendes".[3] The controversy is about the relationship, if any, which exists between the *Passio Typasii* and the *Vita Martini* of Sulpicius Severus.[4] The purpose of this note is to highlight a more direct and verifiable relationship between the *Passio Typasii* and another text, the overlooked source of its historical digressions.

It is not unusual for hagiographical texts to attempt to provide a wider historical context for the events which they are about to relate. However such attempts usually result in broad references to the reigns of the emperors in question, with sweeping statements about the propagation of edicts of persecution. The *Passio Typasii* is unusual in that it rises above such sweeping statements, and proceeds to describe a number of historic events in a quite specific manner. This has led one

commentator to say of its author, "Il a des prétentions d'historien".[5] For our purpose here it is necessary to reproduce at length the text which led to this judgement.

(*Passio Typasii 1*)

In temporibus Diocletiani et Maximiani imperatorum parva adhuc christianitatis religio fuerat et per universam propemodum terram bella surrexerant. Nam in partibus Orientis Narseus quidam nomine assumpserat tyrannidem, in Britannia Carausius rebellaverat, Achilleus Aegyptum Lybiamque vastabat, in partibus quoque Galliarum Bacaudae crudeliter saeviebant. Praeterea in Sitifensi provincia gentiles, qui semper pacati fuerant et Quinquegentiani vocantur, direptis provincialium facultatibus atque universis possessoribus incolisque prostratis, latrocinia perpetrabant.

After some digression on the topic of the Quinquegentiani there followed shortly a description of the promotion of the emperor Maximianus.

Diocletianus itaque, oppressus tantorum clade bellorum, Maximianum ex Caesare fecit Augustum eumque adversus Quinquegentianos ad Sitifensem misit, qui edicto suo universos ad auxilium milites convocaret.

It is not unnatural to inquire whether the author of this text has used a particular historical source rather than assume any originality on his part. All the more so because his performance in this matter is so unusual. One turns firstly, because of the very nature of the text, to a christian historical source, in particular the continuation by Jerome of the *Chronicon* of Eusebius of Caesarea. There the following text can be found:

(Jer. *Chron. 225*)[6]

... qui, rusticorum multitudine oppressa quae factioni suae Bacaudarum nomen indiderat, pacem Galliis reddidit. Carausius sumpta purpura Britannias occupavit, Narseus Orienti bellum intulit, Quinquegentiani Africam infestaverunt, Aegyptum Achilleus obtinuit: ob quae Constantius et Galerius Maximianus Caesares adsumuntur in regnum, quorum Constantius Claudii ex filia nepos fuit, Galerius in Dacia haut longe a Serdica natus, ...

There is a strong similarity between these texts in that they both provide a condensed catalogue of the same historical events. However there is no verbal correspondence whatsoever. Consider in contrast to this the

parallel passage from the *Breviarum* of Eutropius, the work which Jerome drew upon as a source for much of his *Chronicon.*[7]

(Eutrop. *Brev.IX.22*)

Ita cum per omnem orbem terrarum res turbatae essent, Carausius in Brittanniis rebellaret, Achilleus in Aegypto, Africam Quinquegentiani infestarent, Narseus Orienti bellum inferret, Diocletianus Maximianum Herculium ex Caesare fecit Augustum, Constantium et Maximianum Caesares, quorum Constantius per filiam nepos Claudi traditur, Maximianus Galerius in Dacia haud longe a Serdica natus.

The first noteworthy feature of this passage is that it precedes its catalogue of wars with a statement that the whole world was in turmoil in much the same manner that the *Passio Typasii* also precedes its catalogue of wars with a statement about the general condition of the world. The phrase *per omnem orbem terrarum* is distinctly reminiscent of the *per universum propemodum terram* of the latter.

There is also on this occasion some verbal similarity in the description of the rebellion of Carausius by the two texts, the verb *rebellare* being used in each case. More noteworthy still is the identical way in which they describe the promotion of Maximianus, *ex Caesare fecit Augustum*. Clearly the closer links are between the *Passio Typasii* and the *Breviarium* of Eutropius rather than the *Passio* and *Chronicon* of Jerome. This is confirmed by an examination of another historical reference which occurs towards the end of the *Passio Typasii*.

(*Passio Typasii 8.10*)[8]

Sed Maximianus, qui persecutionis huius fuerat princeps, dum sub praetextu inimicitiarum Maxentii filii sui Constantino imperatori genero suo pararet insidias, detectus per Faustam filiam suam, quae dolo marito renuntiaverat, profugit Massiliaeque oppressus, ea causa Constantini iussu est peremptus; ut de omnibus sanctus martyr Typasius doceatur de iudicio vindicatus.

On comparison with Eutropius' account of the same event it can be seen that the author of the *Passio* has confined himself to excerpting the required text with the very minimum of amendment.

(Eutrop. *Brev. X.3*)

Detectis igitur insidiis per Faustam filiam, quae dolum viro nuntiaverat, profugit Herculius Massiliaeque oppressus (ex ea enim navigare ad filiam praeparabat) poenas dedit iustissimo exitu. ...

Jerome's treatment of the same topic also shows clearly his indebtedness to the work of Eutropius. However he chose to exercise his editorial ability a little more.

(Jer. *Chron. 229*)

Herculius Maximianus, a filia Fausta detectus, quod dolum Constantino viro suo pararet, Massiliae fugiens occiditur.

The similarities are such that there can be little doubt but that the author of the *Passio Typasii* used the *Breviarum* of Eutropius to provide him with some authentic historical background in his composition. This is not a surprising discovery.[9] As already indicated Jerome had turned to the *Breviarium* as a source in his *Chronicon* c. 380, there is the possibility that Sulpicius Severus was familiar with the text, and the Spanish presbyter Orosius certainly used it in his *Historiae Adversus Paganos* c. 417.[10] The use of the *Breviarium* by Orosius is of particular relevance here because he composed that work at the request of Augustine of Hippo while he was a refugee in Africa from Gothic occupied Spain. It would seem therefore that the *Breviarium* of Eutropius had achieved a wide readership among the North African christian community. However this discovery is of some importance also in furthering our understanding of the *Passio Typasii*.

Its prime importance is as an aid in dating this work. It is generally accepted that the *Breviarium* of Eutropius can be firmly dated c. 369/70.[11] Thus a terminus post quem of c. 369/70 can now be firmly attributed to the *Passio Typasii*, or at least that recension which we now possess. No-one would suggest, I think, that it was Eutropius who used the *Passio Typasii* as his source, and not vice versa. Previous to this attempts to date this work rested solely on lexicographical grounds. These arguments were useful and necessary in the absence of any firmer evidence but were not as conclusive as one would have liked. Stancliffe, for example, dated the whole text on the basis of the double occurrence of just one word, *monasterium*.[12] As Augustine did not use this word before c. 396 she preferred to date the *Passio* to the late 390s. But why should Augustine have been the first North African to demonstrate any knowledge of this term? Monceaux was guided in his attribution of the *Passio* to the age of Augustine by the occurrence of the phrase *requievit in pace*.[13] How can we be sure that we can exactly date the first occurrence of this phrase? In either case the whole text has been dated by a small element which may represent a late amendment or addition to the original. The present attribution has the double merit of resting both upon a secure base date and a more representative sample of the text.

Yet the present discovery renders us a more valuable service than the provision of an absolute terminus post quem. It provides us also with

an important insight into the method of the author of the present recension of the *Passio Typasii*. It proves, where proof had been lacking previously, that he turned to other literary works as sources for his composition in addition, perhaps, to the original authentic acta. This is of direct relevance to the controversy surrounding the similarities between the *Vita Martini* and the *Passio Typasii*. It shows that it is indeed a strong possibility, if not probability, that it was the author of the *Passio Typasii* who turned to the *Vita Martini* as a source, and not vice versa. Thus although the present discovery provides us with an absolute terminus post quem of c. 369/70, it provides us with further evidence also that a date after the composition of the *Vita Martini* c. 396 is actually to be preferred.

We gain further insight also into the method and intentions of the author. As he used the *Breviarium* of Eutropius as his source we can be sure that he did not intend to date the discharge of Typasius from the army to any particular year. Eutropius's work was a continuous narrative and did not systematically assign events to particular years. If he had used Jerome's *Chronicon* as his source the opposite would have been the case. If he did not choose to reproduce the condensed catalogue of wars from the *Breviarium* because it was attributed to the particular year within which he wished to set the discharge of Typasius, then he must have been led to do so for some other reason entirely. Clearly it was the subject matter itself which attracted his attention.

Just as when he turned to the *Breviarium* later when he needed to describe the death of Maximianus, so in this case he turned to the *Breviarium* when he needed an African war. This raises an important question about the 'actes authentiques' as they have been called. Did they mention the Quinquegentiani at all? Indeed if one accepts that the *Passio Typasii* used the *Vita Martini* as the source for its description of the events which led to the discharge of Typasius the situation becomes more serious still. Were there any authentic acts at all? The first half of the *Passio* is explicable solely in terms of the *Breviarium* and the *Vita Martini*. Once he had chosen a scene from the *Vita Martini* from which to fashion his account our author had also to find a suitable enemy. Martin had refused to fight for the emperor against the Germans. Obviously there was no question of there being German attacks in North Africa, and our author was forced to turn to a historical source, Eutropius' *Breviarium*, to find a suitable enemy. Hence the Quinquegentiani.

Once severe doubt is cast upon the first half of the *Passio* in this manner, questions must be raised also about its second half. In its description of the accusations made against Typasius that he was a deserter, and Typasius' defence against these accusations, it presupposes something very much like the first half as it presents it.[14] Futhermore its accounts of a miracle worked by Typasius upon one of his guards, and the grisly death of the principal architects of Typasius' martyrdom, suggest further unidentified literary influences.[15] There is no core passage to which, it might plausibly be argued, all the rest was added later. The acts as a whole fall under grave suspicion, not just one or two passages.

To conclude, the evidence suggests that the author of the *Passio Typasii* used as one of his sources the *Breviarium* of Eutropius. Thus there is more reason than ever before for doubting the veracity of this *Passio* as it can no longer be accepted as an independent witness to the historical events which it purports to describe. This is particularly true of its description of Maximianus' campaign against the Quinquegentiani. The assumption that authentic acta underlie this *Passio* is weakened accordingly.

NOTES

[1] C. Smedt, "Passiones Tres Martyrum Africanorum", *Analecta Bollandiana* 9 (1890), 107-34.

[2] E. Diehl, *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres* (3 Vols., Berlin, 1925-31), I, no. 2067. The *Passio Typasii* has often been accepted among the more reliable hagiographic texts and its evidence used accordingly, e.g. J.-M. Hornus, It Is Not Lawful For Me To Fight (Scottdale, Penn., 1980), pp. 136-37; J. Helgeland, "Christians in the Roman Army, A.D. 173-337", *ANRW* II.23.1 (1979), pp. 785-87.

[3] P. Monceaux, "Etude critique sur le Passio Tipasii Veterani", *Revue archeologique 4* (1904), 267-74, p. 274.

[4] J. Fontaine, "Sulpice Severe a-t-il travesti Saint Martin de Tours en martyr militaire?", *Analecta Bollandiana* 81, (1963), 31-58, pp.43-48; C. Stancliffe, *St. Martin and His Hagiographer* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 144-48.

[5] P. Monceaux, art. cit., p. 269.

[6] The reference is to the page number in the edition of R. Helm, *Eusebius Werke 7: Die Chronik des Hieronymus* (Leipzig, 1913).

[7] R. Helm, "Hieronymus und Eutrop", *RhM, N.F.* 76 (1927), 138-70, 254-306.

[8] The text has been reproduced as originally edited and published. However one should note that the manuscript originally read *paratas insidias*, not *pararet insidias*, and *Constantino iustus*, not *Constantini iussu*. It is obvious likewise that *dolo* should be emended to *dolum*.

[9] A. Momigliano, "Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century A.D.", *The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century* (Oxford, 1973), 79-99, p. 86.

[10] On Sulpicius Severus, C. Stancliffe, op. cit., pp. 59, 178-79; on Orosius, e.g. C. Santini, "L'Adversum paganos di Orosio e la tradizione manoscritta del Breviarium di Eutropio", *Giornale Italiano di Filologia* 30 (1978), 79-91. For comparative purposes it is worth quoting here Orosius' account of the death of Maximianus, *Adv. Pag.* VII.28: ..., *ut Constantino genero aeque dolis iunctus auferret imperium. Sed per filiam deprehensus et proditus, deinde in fugam versus Massiliae oppressus et interfectus est.* Clearly there is no possibility of our author having used Orosius as an intermediate source.

[11] e.g. W. den Boer, *Some Minor Roman Historians* (Leiden, 1972), p. 114.

[12] C. Stancliffe, op. cit., p. 146.

[13] P. Monceaux, art. cit., p. 274.

[14] See the martyrdom of Julius the veteran, H. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs* (Oxford, 1972), 260-65, for comparative purposes.

[15] The man responsible for Typasius' death, the praepositus Doncius, and the decurion Lucius, died horribly in a manner reminiscent of the christian description of the death of Galerius Maximianus. However the *Passio Typasii* does not reveal any striking similarity to our surviving Latin sources in this matter, Lactantius, *Mort. Pers. 33*; Orosius, *Adv. Pag. VII.28.12*; Rufinus, *HE. VIII.16.* It omits the reference to worms, while including the new torments of a loss of the eyes and fevers.

Dominic St., *Mullingar*, Co Westmeath, Eire

Vigiliae Christianae 47 (1993), 85-87, E.J. Brill, Leiden

ZWEI SPLITTER FRÜHCHRISTLICHER LITERATUR

VON

GÜNTHER CHRISTIAN HANSEN

Eine aus dem 10. Jahrhundert stammende, in Florenz in der Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana aufbewahrte Pergamenthandschrift (plut. 70,7) mit den Kirchengeschichten des Eusebios und des Sokrates hat etwa im 14. Jahrhundert einen interessierten Leser gefunden, dem noch manche Werke der frühchristlichen und spätantiken Literatur zu Gebote standen, die wir längst verschollen glaubten. Der findige Leser, der sich auf der letzten Seite der Handschrift (fol. 391^{v}) als Germanos vorstellt, bezeugt (fol. 209^{r}), daß er bei einem Mönch Kallistos in einer thrakischen Provinzstadt die griechische Fassung der Kirchengeschichte Rufins, also wohl deren Vorlage, die Kirchengeschichte des Gelasios von Kaisareia, entdeckt und gelesen hat.[1]

Auch sonst zeigt er eine Literaturkenntnis, die nicht alltäglich ist. Neben den Kirchenhistorikern Sozomenos (fol. 315^{v}) und Theodoret (fol. 198^{v}, 262^{v}) vermag er das Panarion des Epiphanios (fol. 201^{v}, 217^{r}) und den Protreptikos des Clemens (fol. 294^{v}) zu zitieren, selbstverständlich auch eine Homilie des Basileios (fol. 242^{v}). Am interessantesten ist eine Liste frühchristlicher Schriftsteller, die an Eusebs Bemerkung im Brief an seine Gemeinde[2] anknüpft, wonach einige frühere Theologen und angesehene Bischöfe den Begriff des *homousios* auf das Verhältnis von Vater und Sohn angewendet hätten. An dieser Stelle (fol. 200^{v}) findet man im Mediceus 70,7 von erster Hand ein Scholion ὡς Θεόγνωστον τὸν Ἀλεξανδρείας, eine notierenswerte Ergänzung zu dem Referat des Photios (*cod.* 106), dem wir die Kenntnis der *Hypotyposeis* des Theognostos im wesentlichen verdanken.[3] Diesem einzelnen Namen nun hängt Germanos folgende Ergänzung an: καὶ διονύσιον τὸν αὐτῆς, ἰουστίνον φιλόσοφον, ὠριγένιν τε καὶ μιλτιάδιν καὶ τὸν θεοφιλῆν θεόφιλον ἀντιοχείας ἐν τῷ περὶ ἐνσωματώσεως. Könnte man noch annehmen, seine Kenntnis über Dionysios von Alexandreia habe er vor allem aus der Schrift des Athanasios[4] bezogen, Iustinos und Miltiades bei Euseb[5] gefunden, auch für Origenes sich auf das Zeugnis des Athanasios[6] stüt-

zen können, so scheidet die Möglichkeit einer Vermittlung aus zweiter Hand für die angeführte Schrift des Theophilos von Antiocheia aus. Ein Werk Περὶ ἐνσωματώσεως, *De incarnatione*,[7] ist sonst nirgends bezeugt. Es wird zu den *plurima ingenii opera* gehören, die Hieronymus bezeugt.[8] Offenbar ist es im 14. Jahrhundert noch vorhanden gewesen.

Hatte Germanos, der findige Leser, Origenes soeben noch zu den Theologen gezählt, die Vater und Sohn für wesensgleich erkannt hätten, so stellt er an einer anderen Stelle ebendies unter Berufung auf ein Werk des Origenes in Abrede.

Sokrates[9] verteidigt die Rechtgläubigkeit des Eusebios von Kaisareia, »besonders weil er ein Anhänger und Bewunderer der Werke des Origenes ist, in denen, wer diese Werke in ihrer tiefen Bedeutung zu verstehen vermag, allenthalben die Lehre von der Geburt des Sohnes aus dem Vater entdecken kann«. Gegen diese etwas laienhafte Argumentation, mit der unser sympathischer Kirchenhistoriker über die Probleme hinweggeht, wendet sich der Protest des Germanos (fol. 243^{v}): ἐνθαδὶ φλυαρεῖς· οὐ γὰρ ὡς φῆς τἀληθὲς ἔχει ὁ λόγος· εἰ δ' ὅτι θαυμαστὴς ἦν ὁ ἀσεβεῖς εὐσέβειος τῶν χρονολήρου ὠριγένους βιβλίων, ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ἀπελογίσατο ὡς ἦν εὐσεβεῖς· διὰ τοῦτω γε μᾶλλον τῶ ἀναθέματι αὐτὸν παραβάλλει· ὁ γὰρ ὠριγένης πολλὰ φλυαρεῖ κατὰ τῆς τοῦ μονογενοῦς δόξις· ὡς ἐν τῶ προοιμίω τοῦ ἄσματος τῶν ἀσμάτων, οὗ ἡ ἀρχὴ, ἐπιθαλάμιον ἅμα ἆσμα καὶ δράμα γεγράφθε μοι τῶ σαλομῶντι τῶ βιβλίον τοῦτω δοκεῖ· εἶτα μετ' ὀλίγα παραφρονοφλυαρεῖ, τὸν υἱὸν τῶ πατρὶ ἀνόμοιον κακοσυλλογίζεται. »Hier gehst du in die Irre; denn in Wahrheit verhält sich die Sache nicht so, wie du behauptest. Wenn der unfromme Eusebios, weil er ein Bewunderer der Werke des alten Schwätzers[10] Origenes war, dessen Rechtgläubigkeit verteidigte, so setzt er ihn damit umso mehr dem Verdammungsspruch aus. Denn Origenes faselt vieles wider die Herrlichkeit des eingeborenen Sohnes, etwa in der Vorrede zum Hohenlied, die mit den Worten beginnt: 'Salomon hat mit diesem Buch, wie mir scheint, zugleich ein Hochzeitslied und ein Drama geschrieben'; bald danach faselt er verrücktes Zeug und zieht den irrigen Schluß,[11] daß der Sohn dem Vater ungleich sei.«

Die Randbemerkung, die zugleich einen Eindruck von der manierierten Sprache des Germanos vermittelt, die zu seiner Gleichgültigkeit gegenüber der Orthographie seltsam kontrastiert, liefert uns den griechischen Wortlaut des ersten Satzes von Origenes' Kommentar zum Hohenlied, der uns sonst nur in Rufins Übersetzung[12] überliefert ist. Er lautet: 'Επιθαλάμιον ἅμα ᾆσμα καὶ δρᾶμα γεγράφθαι μοι τῷ Σαλομῶντι τὸ βιβλίον τοῦτο δοκεῖ.

Von den dann, nach dem Zeugnis des Germanos, sich anschließenden Gedanken, die sich als anhomöisch deuten ließen, im übrigen ganz zur Denkweise des Origenes passen würden, findet sich in der Version Rufins nichts. Vermutlich hat Rufin sie aus theologischer Rücksichtnahme retuschiert.

ANMERKUNGEN

[1] G. Chr. Hansen, Germanos der findige Leser, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 84/85 (1991/1992), Heft 2.

[2] Sokr. *hist. eccl.* I 8,51 = Urkunde 22,13 Opitz (*Athanasius Werke III 1: Urkunden zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites*, Berlin/Leipzig 1934, 46).

[3] Vgl. auch Ath. *de decr. Nic. syn.* 25,2; A. Harnack, *TU* 24, 3, Leipzig 1903, 73ff.; O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur* II, Freiburg i. B. ²1914, 230-234; O. Stählin in: W. v. Christ, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur* II 2, München ⁶1924, 1344.

[4] Ath. *de sent. Dion.* 18,2, vgl. auch *de decr. Nic. syn.* 25,3-5.

[5] Eus. *hist. eccl.* V 28,4.

[6] Ath. *de decr. Nic. syn.* 27.

[7] G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford 1961-1968, zitiert sechs Belege für ἐνσωμάτωσις.

[8] Hier. *chron.* 205ⁱ, vgl. auch Eus. *hist. eccl.* IV 24; Bardenhewer I 302-315; A. Harnack, *Die Überlieferung der griechischen Apologeten* (TU 1), Leipzig 1882, 282ff.; ders., *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* I, Leipzig 1893, 496ff.; Stählin 1293f.

[9] Sokr. *hist. eccl.* II 21,23 μάλιστα δὲ ὅτι ζηλωτὴς καὶ θαυμαστὴς τῶν 'Ωριγένους βιβλίων ἐστίν, ἐν οἷς πανταχοῦ τὸν υἱὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα εὑρίσκουσιν οἱ τῶν 'Ωριγένους βιβλίων τὸ βάθος κατανοῆσαι δυνάμενοι.

[10] χρονόληρος ein Wort der alten Komödie (*com. ad.* 1052 Kock, Poll. 2,16, Plut. *mor.* 13 B).

[11] παραφρονοφλυαρεῖ, wenn es richtig gelesen ist, und κακοσυλλογίζεται zeugen von der Vorliebe des Germanos für zusammengesetzte Bildungen der alten Komödie, es sind für uns Hapax legomena.

[12] Origenes *Werke* VIII, hrsg. v. W. A. Baehrens (GCS 33), Leipzig 1925, 61: *Epithalamium libellus hic, id est nuptiale carmen, dramatis in modum mihi videtur a Solomone conscriptus.*

Postfach 15, O-1162 *Berlin*

Vigiliae Christianae 47 (1993), 88-102, E.J. Brill, Leiden

REVIEWS

Stylianos G. Papadopoulos, *Patrologia*, II: *Ho tetartos aiônas* (*Anatolê kai Dysê*). Athêna, Parousia, 1990. 758 S.

Dieser zweite Band der umfangreichen Patrologie von St. Papadopoulos umfasst die patristische Literatur des vierten Jahrhunderts, wobei das Todesjahr der Schriftsteller ausschlaggebend ist für die Aufnahme. Der erste Band ist erschienen im Jahre 1977. Im selben Jahre erschien auch der erste Band der von K.G. Bonês verfassten griechischen Patrologie unter dem Titel »Christliche Literatur. Philologische und kritische Geschichte der Väter und der kirchlichen Schriftsteller«. Papadopulos, Patristiker der Universität Athen und Autor mehrerer patristisch-theologischen Monographien (vor allem über Athanasios, Basileios den Grossen, Gregorios von Nazianz und Gregorios von Nyssa), bietet, nach einer kurzen allgemeinen Einleitung über die geistige Lage und die Theologie des vierten Jahrhunderts, in chronologischer Ordnung eine Zusammenstellung griechischer, lateinischer, koptischer und syrischer Autoren und Werke mit sehr ausführlichen Literaturangaben. Zur Auswahl: von den nichtchristlichen Autoren ist Porphyrios aufgenommen, Kaiser Julianos nicht; indes findet man Namen, die nicht erwähnt sind in der *Patrologie* von B. Altaner und A. Stuiber, wie Aithalla von Edessa (S. 108) und Euprepios von Paltos (S. 433). Papadopulos geht es in seinen Darstellungen vor allem um die Theologie, und bes. um die orthodoxe Theologie. Daher auch die vielen Seiten, die dem Athanasios und den Kappadokiern gewidmet sind, während bes. auch noch die Pseudo-Macariana, grundlegend für die orthodoxe Aszese und Mystik, ausgiebig zu Worte kommen. Der Band ist somit nicht nur Nachschlagewerk und Repertorium, sondern Einführung in die patristische Theologie der Ostkirche und deren Nachwirkung geworden. Die gewählte Methode, Autoren und Anonyma einfach der Reihe nach, ohne nähere Systematisierung nach geographischen Gebieten oder theologischen Zentren zu besprechen, ist, vor allem wo es sich handelt um anonyme Schriften, Konzilien und dergl., umständlich und unübersichtlich; dabei hilft leider auch der Index nicht ab. Indes zeigen die Literaturangaben (neben vielem anderen), in welchem Masse Griechenland sich an der patristischen Forschung beteiligt hat. Eine konse-

quente Verwendung des zweiten Bandes der *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* (1974) wäre willkommen gewesen. Für die lateinischen Kirchenväter wird man (neben *Restauration und Erneuerung. Die lateinische Literatur von 284 bis 374 n. Chr.*, hrsg. v. A. Herzog, München 1989) bes. noch den dritten Band der *Patrologia*, hrsg. v. A. di Berardino, Turin 1978, benützen bleiben.

Papadopulos behandelt mitunter die Benutzung der Homiletik in den liturgischen Gesängen, wie z.B. bei Gregorios von Nazianz (S. 513ff.). Das Phänomen ist ebenfalls bei Gregorios von Nyssa zu betrachten: auch seine Texte können in der byzantinischen Hymnodik wieder aftauchen; man vergleiche etwa Greg. Nyss., *De tridui spatio*, GNO IX, 1, S. 274, Z. 12ff., und das Triodion zu Karsamstag, W. Christ — M. Paranikas, *Anthologia graeca carminum christianorum* (Leipzig 1871), S. 92, Z. 35ff.:

Greg. Nyss.	Triod.
ἰδού σοι τῆς πρώτης κοσμογενείας τὸ εὐλογημένον σάββατον, γνώρισον δι' ἐκείνου τοῦ σαββάτου τοῦτο τὸ σάββατον τὴν τῆς καταπαύσεως ἡμέραν, ἣν εὐλόγησεν ὁ θεὸς ὑπὲρ τὰς ἄλλας ἡμέρας.	καὶ εὐλόγησεν ὁ θεὸς τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἑβδόμην· / τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ εὐλογημένον σάββατον· / αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ τῆς καταπαύσεως ἡμέρα, /
ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς κατέπαυσεν ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ ὁ μονογενὴς θεὸς διὰ τῆς κατὰ τὸν θάνατον οἰκονομίας τῇ σαρκὶ σαββατίσας καὶ εἰς ὃ ἦν πάλιν ἐπανελθὼν διὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἅπαν τὸ	ἐν ᾗ κατέπαυσεν ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ· / διὰ τῆς κατὰ τὸν θάνατον οἰκονομίας τῇ σαρκὶ σαββατίσας καὶ εἰς ὃ ἦν πάλιν ἐπανελθών, / διὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως / ἐδωρήσατο ἡμῖν
κείμενον ἑαυτῷ συνανέστησε ζωὴ καὶ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἀνατολὴ καὶ ὄρθρος καὶ ἡμέρα τοῖς ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου γενόμενος.	ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον, / ὡς μόνος ἀγαθὸς καὶ φιλάνθρωπος.

6533 SN *Nijmegen*, Heidebloemstraat 121 A. DAVIDS

Andreas Lindemann, *Die Clemensbriefe* (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 17. Die Apostolischen Väter I). J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, 1992. VI, 277.

The two writings under the name of Clement, of which the first one is genuine and the second spurious, are among the most important witnesses to Early Christianity apart from those found in the New Testament itself. 1 Clement dates from the end of the first century, and was written in Rome; 2 Clement was written a little later, and is of unknown origin.

With regard to their contents the two writings have little in common. 1 Clement is a letter written by the bishop of Rome, who intervenes in the situation in the Church of Corinth without having been asked to do so. In spite of the letter's length it does not become clear exactly why a group of younger Christians rebelled against older members in their community. In order to stop this rebellion Clement draws on various arguments, many of which were taken from the Hellenistic world. His writing reveals a particular literary skill, which has recently been the subject of investigation. It is striking that no references can be found to the 'Gospel' or the 'Words of Jesus'. 2 Clement, on the contrary, does refer to the Gospel tradition more than once, but in some cases it is not clear what the origin of the tradition is. This work may perhaps be of less importance for our knowledge of the development of the early Church, but it does contain a number of interesting theological ideas.

It is evident that the author of the commentary under review did not aim to write a monograph on these writings. The reader is presented with the various points of view, together with his own carefully weighed conclusions, supplemented on occasion with some excursus. The author has also added a "Beilage zu 1 Clem. 25. Griechische, römische, jüdische und christliche Texte zur Erzählung vom Vogel Phönix" (interesting and useful, but we are left wondering why this particular collection of references?).

Lindemann had to conform to the formal appearance of commentaries in the series "Handbuch zum Neuen Testament". This means that footnotes are absent, much information has been added in brackets, and that statements are rather concisely formulated, sometimes to the point of being apodictic.

If we should be asked to give a general conclusion on this study, we would state that we prefer the contents of the part dealing with 1 Cle-

ment. The part dealing with the second letter seems not quite as satisfying. For example, an intriguing subject like the text concerning the Church in ch. 16 could have been given a more profound treatment.

NL-9751 NG *Haren*, Dilgtweg 18A A.F.J. Klijn

Dom Louis Leloir, *Écrits Apocryphes sur les Apôtres.* Traduction de l'Édition Arménienne de Venise. II: Philippe, Barthélemy, Thomas, Matthieu, Jacques Frère du Seigneur, Thaddée, Simon, Listes d'Apôtres (Corpus Christianorum. Series Apocryphorum 4). Turnhout, Brepols, 1992. LVIII, 419-828.

This is the second part of a translation of Father Cherubin Tcherakian's Armenian edition of Apocryphal Acts originally published in 1904 (on part I see *Vig. Christ.* 41 (1987) 405-406). The edition was based on manuscripts available in Venice at that time. But its contents remained not easily accessible because the edition was in the Armenian language only.

Dom Leloir has not only translated the text, but also placed the various writings into the wider textual frame-work of parallel Armenian manuscripts and related texts in the Greek edition of the apocryphal Acts of Lipsius-Bonnet and elsewhere. In several cases Syriac texts proved also to be of importance.

In comparison with the five famous original Acts of the Apostles, viz. those of Paul, Peter, John, Andrew and Thomas, we can notice a decreasing interest in miraculous details, resulting in mere summaries of older texts. But this is compensated by an increasing interest in the martyrdom of the apostles and in the traditions surrounding the fate of their remains.

We have to do here partly with the rewriting of existing Acts, and partly with original works written in accordance with the taste of the time in which they originated. This means that their contents have to be evaluated with the help of their particular theological and historical background. They are thus of no value for the our understanding and reconstruction of the text and contents of previous Acts which existed under the same name.

Dom Leloir deserves our deepest thanks, not only for having made this group of interesting texts accessible to a wider group of scholars,

but also for the extremely thorough and competent way in which he has done so.

NL-9751 NG *Haren*, Dilgtweg 18A A.F.J. KLIJN

Origenes, *In Lucam Homiliae/Homilien zum Lukasevangelium.* Lateinisch, Griechisch, Deutsch. Übersetzt und eingeleitet von Hermann-Josef Sieben S.J. 2 Bände (Fontes Christiani 4/1-2). Herder, Freiburg usw., 1992. 635 S.

Zum ersten Mal liegt hier eine deutsche Übersetzung der Homilien zum Lukasevangelium des Origines vor; und, es sei sofort gesagt, eine Übersetzung von höchster Qualität. Man hat beim Lesen ständig das Gefühl, von einem äußerst kundigen Führer geleitet zu werden.

Es handelt sich um 39 ziemlich kurze Predigten, in denen Origenes in lebendiger Art und Weise Perikopen des Lukasevangeliums erklärt.

Bekanntlich ist diese Erklärung uns nur in der lateinischen Übersetzung des Hieronymus überliefert worden. Der Verf. bietet einen Abdruck des von Max Rauer edierten Textes (GCS 49, Berlin, ²1959).

In der Einleitung behandelt der Verf. Leben und Werk des Origenes als Homileten, die Spiritualität, die Datierung und die Adressaten der Lukashomilien, die Übersetzung des Hieronymus und die Überlieferung der Homilien. Diese Einleitung ist ebenfalls ein Muster an Klarheit und Präzision.

Der ursprüngliche griechische Text is nur indirekt, vor allem in den Katenen, überliefert worden. Von den vielen dem Origenes zugeschriebenen Text-Fragmenten (257 in der genannten Ausgabe von Rauer) hat der Verf. 91 Texte aufgenommen. Er folgt dabei F. Fournier, der in der Ausgabe der »Sources Chrétiennes« (Paris 1962) als Auswahl-kriterium angewandt hat, ob die Texte »im Vergleich zur Übersetzung des Hieronymus zusätzliche Nuancen bringen, und ob sie exegetisch interessant und für Origenes typisch sind« (S. 51).

Diese zweisprachige Ausgabe ist eine große Bereicherung der Reihe »Fontes Christiani«.

2312 GD *Leiden,* Haarlemmerstraat 106 J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

Gregorii Nysseni, *De oratione dominica, De beatitudinibus*. Edidit Johannes Callahan (Gregorii Nysseni Opera Vol VII, Pars II). Leiden-New York-Köln, Brill, 1992.

A new volume is added to the *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*. It has been edited by a pupil of the prime mover of this great enterprise, Werner Jaeger. The *collegae gregoriani*, to whom the volume is dedicated, have been waiting for it during many years. They will be satisfied, when they realise its high quality.

The critical text is preceded by an introduction about the text tradition. This tradition, which is fundamentally the same for the two treatises, has a Greek and a Syriac component. The Greek manuscripts are divided in two families, Φ and Ψ. The Syriac tradition, which is closely related to Φ, is represented by two manuscripts, which are a good deal older than the earliest Greek manuscripts. A close study of the relation of the Syriac version of the text to the Greek tradition shows that even in the fifth or sixth century the text tradition was divided in two streams, each marked by its distinctive variants (some of them made for doctrinal reasons). Most of the time the two Greek families, each represented here by 3 specimens, make it possible to draw conclusions about the readings of the archetype. In these cases the apparatus could be relieved of "much unnecessary and distracting material" (p. XLIX).

The editor presents a very clear and precise description of the manuscripts' situation, adding a list of Greek manuscripts not cited in the *conspectus siglorum*. It has seldom been the case that the present reviewer has found the reading of a description of the manuscript tradition to be an easy and pleasant affair. Here this was the case.

The Greek text of these two highly important treatises is edited with meticulous care. The whole book is an example of exactitude. This must have been the ideal which Werner Jaeger had in mind.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106 J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

Harold W. Attridge and Gohei Hata (edd.), *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism* (Studia-Biblica 42). London-New York-Köln, Brill, 1992. 802 p. Gld. 165.00/US $ 94,50.

This huge volume is part of a remarkable enterprise. Professor Gohei Hata made a Japanese translation of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical*

History and desired this translation to be accompanied by a collection of essays (to be published both in Japanese and English) which would throw light on a number of issues of Early Christian history and Jewish-Christian relations raised by Eusebius' book. Earlier Hata had worked on the same formula with regard to the Jewish historian Josephus. Apart from the Japanese translation he compiled, in collaboration with Louis Feldman, a collection of essays on central issues in Josephus' work. The English version appeared in two volumes: *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity* (Detroit, Wayne State University Press, 1987) and *Josephus, the Bible and History* (ibid. 1988).

In the present enterprise Harold W. Attridge of the University of Notre Dame was his collaborator. They assembled an editorical advisory board consisting of Professors Louis Feldman, Kikuo Matsunaga, Michael Stone and Robert Wilken. The result is a magnificent book which, after an Introduction by Attridge and Hata on the life of Eusebius, on his *Ecclesiastical History* and on the organization of this collection, contains 30 essays grouped into eight thematic sections.

It may suffice to enumerate the titles and the names of the authors here, to give the reader of this review an impression of the importance of this book.

I. Christian Origins.
1. R. Horsley, Jesus and Judaism: Christian Perspectives. 2. D. Flusser, Jesus and Judaism: Jewish Perspectives. 3. Ph. Sellew, Eusebius and the Gospels. 3. P. Gorday, Paul in Eusebius and Other Early Christian Literature. 5. D.R. MacDonald, Legends of the Apostles.

II. The growth and expansion of Christianity.
6. Ch.A. Bobertz, The Development of Episcopal Order. 7. S. Brock, Eusebius and Syriac Christianity. 8. J.E. Goehring, The Origins of Monasticism. 9. E. Clark, Eusebius on Women in Early Church History. 10. J. Gutmann, Early Christian and Jewish Art.

III. Orthodoxy and Heresy.
11. B.A. Pearson, Eusebius and Gnosticism. 12. W.L. Petersen, Eusebius and the Paschal Controversy. 13. A.F. Segal, Jewish Christianity.

IV. The Fate of the Jews
14. Kikuo Matsunaga, Christian Self-Identification and the Twelfth Benediction. 15. L.H. Feldman, Jewish Proselytism. 16. A.J. Avery-Peck, Judaism without the Temple: The Mishnah.

V. Eusebius as Apologist.
17. Ch. Kannengiesser, Eusebius of Caesarea, Origenist. 18. W. Adler, Eusebius' *Chronicle* and Its Legacy. 19. A.J. Droge, The Apologetic

Dimensions of the *Ecclesiastical History*. 20. A. Mendelson, Eusebius and the Posthumous Career of Apollonius of Tyana. 21. F.W. Norris, Eusebius on Jesus as Deceiver and Sorcerer.

VI. Eusebius as Exegete.

22. E. Ulrich, The Old Testament Text of Eusebius: The Heritage of Origen. 23. Wataru Mizugaki, "Spirit" and "Search". The Basis of Biblical Hermeneutics in Origen's *On First Principles* 4,1-3. 24. M.J. Hollerich, Eusebius as a Polemical Interpreter of Scripture.

VII. Eusebius and the Empire.

25. Yoshiaki Sato, Martyrdom and Apostasy. 26. T.D. Barnes, The Constantinian Settlement. 27. R.M. Grant, Eusebius and Imperial Propaganda.

VIII. The Legacy of Eusebius.

28. G.F. Chesnut, Eusebius, Augustine, Orosius and the Later Patristic and Medieval Christian Historians. 29. W. Pakter, Early Western Church Law and the Jews. 30. R.L. Wilken, Eusebius and the Christian Holy Land.

2312 GD *Leiden* J.C.M. VAN WINDEN
Haarlemmerstraat 106

Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt, Teil II, Principat, Band 36: Philosophie, Wissenschaften, Technik. 3. Teilband: Philosophie (Stoizismus); 4. Teilband: Philosophie (Epikureismus, Skeptizismus, Kynismus, Orphica; Doxographica). Herausgegeben von W. Haase. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin-New York, 1989 (3. Teilband), 1990 (4. Teilband). xv & 929, xvii & 989 pp. Price DM 580, 630.

It would seem that, *mutatis multis mutandis*, Wolfgang Haase, the editor of *ANRW*, is becoming the Jean-Paul Migne of our century. As in the case of Migne's *Patrologiae*, certain reservations can be—and frequently have been—made about the project's procedure and method. But the scope of the achievement as it unfolds, volume by volume, is already now quite breath-taking. The contents offer an overview of a significant proportion of the scholarship that has been carried out on the history and culture of the first three centuries of our era (with frequent excursions to the centuries before and after). The volume under review focusses on the philosophy of this period. In my earlier discussion of parts 1 & 2 in this journal (vol. 43 (1989) 405-409) I reported that it was planned to contain 4 parts. This estimate proved too optimistic. We are told in the preface to part 4 that the volume will now consist of 6 Teilbände. This review now concentrates on parts 3 & 4. First I give a synopsis of the contents:

Band 36.3

D.E. HAHM, Posidonius's Theory of Historical Causation (1325-1363); R.B. TODD, The Stoics and their Cosmology in the first and second Centuries A.D. (1365-1378); M. LAPIDGE, Stoic Cosmology and Roman Literature, First to Third Centuries A.D. (1379-1429); G. AUJAC, Stoïcisme et Hypothèse géocentrique (1430-1453); H.-J. HORN, Stoische Symmetrie und Theorie des Schönen in der Kaiserzeit (1454-1472); R.J. NEWMAN, *Cotidie meditare.* Theory and Practice of the *meditatio* in Imperial Stoicism (1473-1517); C.E. MANNING, Stoicism and Slavery in the Roman Empire (1518-1543); F.-R. CHAUMARTIN, Quarante ans de recherche sur les œuvres philosophiques de Sénèque (Bibliographie 1945-1985) (1545-1605); J. FILLION-LAHILLE, La production littéraire de Sénèque sous les règnes de Caligula et de Claude, sens philosophique et portée politique: les 'Consolationes' et le 'De ira' (1606-1638); B. MORTUREUX, Les idéaux stoïciens et les premières responsabilités politiques: le 'De clementia' (1639-1685); F.-R. CHAUMARTIN, Les désillusions de Sénèque devant l'évolution de la politique néronienne et l'aspiration à la retraite: Le 'De vita beata' et le 'De beneficiis' (1868-1723); J.-M. ANDRÉ, Sénèque: 'De brevitate uitae', 'De constantia sapientis', 'De tranquillitate animae', 'De otio' (1724-1778); C. CODOÑER, La physique de Sénèque: Ordonnance et structure des 'Naturales quaestiones' (1779-1822); G. MAZZOLI, Le 'Epistulae Morales ad Lucilium' di Seneca. Valore letterario e filosofico (1823-1877); M. LAUSBERG, Senecae operum fragmenta: Überblick und Forschungsbericht (1879-1961); P. GRIMAL, Sénèque et le Stoïcisme Romain (1962-1992); J.M. RIST, Seneca and Stoic Orthodoxy (1993-2012); G.W. MOST, Cornutus and Stoic Allegoresis: A Preliminary Report (2014-2065); M. FREDE, Chaeremon (2067-2103); R. LAURENTI, Musonio, maestro di Epitteto (2105-2146); J.P. HERSHBELL, The Stoicism of Epictetus: Twentieth Century Perspectives (2148-2163); A. JAGU, La Morale d'Epictète et le christianisme (2164-2199); M. ISNARDI PARENTE, Ierocle stoico. Oikeiosis e doveri sociali (2201-2226); E. ASMIS, The Stoicism of Marcus Aurelius (2228-2252).

Band 36.4

J. FERGUSON†, Epicureanism under the Roman Empire (2257-2327); T. DORANDI, Filodemo: gli orientamenti della ricerca attuale (2328-2368); E. ASMIS, Philodemus' Epicureanism (2369-2406); T. DORANDI, Filodemo storico del pensiero antico (2407-2423); M. ISNARDI PARENTE, Diogeniano, gli epicurei e la τύχη (2424-2445), D. CLAY, The Philosophical Inscription of Diogenes of Oenoanda: New Discoveries 1969-1983 (2446-2559); A. STÜCKELBERGER, Die atomistik in römischer Zeit: Rezeption und Verdrängung (2561-2580); J. ALLEN, The Skepticism of Sextus Empiricus (2582-2607); J. BARNES, Pyrrhonism, Belief and Causation. Observations on the Scepticism of Sextus Empiricus (2608-2695); G. CORTASSA, Il programma dello scettico; struttura e forme di argumentazione del primo libro

delle 'Ipotiposi pirroniche' di Sesto Empirico (2696-2718); M.-O. GOULET-CAZÉ, Le cynisme à l'époque impériale (2720-2833); J. HAMMERSTAEDT, Der Kyniker Oenomaus von Gadara (2834-2865); L. BRISSON, Orphée et l'Orphisme à l'époque impériale. Témoignages et interprétations philosophiques, de Plutarque à Jambliche (2867-2931); D.E. HAHM, The Ethical Doxography of Arius Didymus (2935-3055); J. MANSFELD, Doxography and Dialectic. The *Sitz im Leben* of the 'Placita' (3056-3229); Indices to the articles of CLAY and HAHM (3231-3243).

As the synopsis shows, Volume 36.3 is entirely devoted to imperial Stoicism, with a heavy concentration on Seneca (separate analyses of all his philosophical works, mainly by French scholars). The single contribution on Posidonius with which the volume starts is a bit of a *Fremdkörper*. Volume 36.4 covers more ground. For the section on Epicureanism Lucretius is excluded, but his older contemporary Philodemus receives attention in three excellent contributions. Special mention should be made of the long section by Diskin Clay on the remarkable finds of Martin Ferguson Smith and John Hall at Oenoanda during the past two decades. Everyone who wants to obtain an overview of the complex subject of Diogenes' Philosophical Inscription should start here. There is some overlap between the three articles on Sextus Empiricus, but, given the relatively limited amount of literature on this author, readers will not complain. An excellent feature is that some of the longer contributions, which virtually amount to monographs, have been thoroughly indexed (Clay, Goulet-Cazé, Hahm, Mansfeld).

The assembled material of nearly 2000 pages is so beautifully presented that the reviewer feels the greatest hesitation in taking up his critical task. Honesty constrains me, however, to mention the following three areas where certain difficulties lie. Firstly, there is a lack of uniformity in the method and approach of the various contributions. Many of them are primarily *Forschungsberichte*, and as such are generally very useful and successful. Other articles undertake to deal with a subject in a synoptic fashion, referring to previous research only to the extent that it supports their survey (e.g., the articles by Barnes and Frede). A number of contributions give a lengthy diachronic survey of a particular school of thought with reference to a large number of authors (Lapidge, Ferguson, Goulet-Cazé, Brisson). Finally there are a small number of articles which present research that is quite original. Two prominent examples of the last category are the excellent and innovative articles on doxography at the end of Volume 36.4. The danger here is that these important contributions will be overlooked by

those who think that *ANRW* is primarily a place for reports on research rather than the research itself. Secondly, there is the continual problem of the redaction date of the contributions. The policy appears to be to say as little as possible about this aspect. Especially in the case of the *Forschungsberichte*, such a policy is a disservice to the reader, who wants to know how recent the proffered information is. In one extreme case a book of 1976 is 'recent' and one of 1978 is 'new' (article of Rist, footnote 3, page 1994). Clay's article has two Epilogues, one dated 1980, the other 1988. Other articles, however, could not be more up-to-date (e.g. the contributions of Dorandi and Mansfeld). Thirdly, there is inevitably some variation in the quality of material presented. My impression is, however, that the general standard of these two volumes is rather high. Only in a limited number of cases did I have serious reservations.

The reviewer will be forgiven if he does not give detailed comments on such a vast quantity of material. In the remainder of my review I will point out and make comments on a number of articles which contain material that will be of special interest for Patristic scholars.

LAPIDGE (pp. 1379-1429): contains a valuable survey of Stoic cosmology in Roman authors from the 1st to the 3rd centuries. By late antiquity Stoic cosmology was for the most part reduced to "a few memorable metaphors", which "continued to live in the writings of Christian Church Fathers (1429)" (are there any Church Fathers who are not Christian?). If a non-Stoic such as Apuleius is included because he uses Stoic terminology in his translation of the *De mundo*, why not also include an author such as Minucius Felix who uses Stoic cosmological terms for apologetic purposes?

NEWMAN (1473-1517): argues against any direct connection between ancient and later Christian practice in the area of meditation and spiritual exercises, for "both methods of meditation can be derived independently from the general human phenomenon of *Nachdenken*, by which possible future evil events are mentally anticipated (1476, n. 6)". This assertion seems *a priori* most unlikely given the wide distribution of Roman Stoic writings in the late Middle Ages, Renaissance and later. No mention is made of the highly influential studies of P. Hadot on the subject of spiritual exercises.

CHAUMARTIN (1545-1605): this excellent bibliography contains sections on the *Epistulae ad Paulum* and Seneca's influence on Christian authors in the Patristic period and later (1596ff.).

MOST (2014-2065) and FREDE (2067-2103): the discussions on allegory in Cornutus and Egyptian wisdom in Chaeremon are of great interest for the study of Philo and the early Christian Fathers.

JAGU (2164-2199): the contribution on Epictetus and Christianity is dated and disappointing. Nearly all works referred to are in French; the most recent study cited in the short list of works is from 1973. Not a word about the exciting work done in this area by scholars such as A. Malherbe and S.K. Stowers. The seminal article by M. Spanneut in *RAC* vol. 5 remains indispensable on this subject.

FERGUSON (2257-2327): this extensive study on Epicureanism under the Roman Empire was left unfinished at the author's death, so perhaps does not match up to his original aims and intentions. In its treatment of the 2nd to 5th centuries numerous Christian authors are mentioned. Regrettably, however, the study amounts to no more than a superficial and tedious catalogue, laced with curious remarks such as that "[Plutarch's] opposition [to Epicureanism] is so strong that we feel that he is repressing something with himself (2286)", and that "Clement of Alexandria seems the sanest of the Church Fathers (2303)". The main aim of the article appears to be to show how much stronger the survival of Epicureanism and Epicurean communities was than has been generally thought. But no effort is made to outline any kind of methodology, and to differentiate between various sources of knowledge that authors may have of Epicurus and his philosophy. Typical is the apparent ignorance of the extensive research done on the sources of Theodoret of Cyrrhus' knowledge of Greek philosophy, which leads the author to suggest that the bishop may have had "firsthand knowledge of Epicurus' own writing (2323)" and even to hint that he may have had contact with actual Epicurean teaching at Antioch (in the early 5th century!). The unfinished state of the article may be responsible for the lack of bibliography here (e.g. the research of Raeder and Canivet). This contribution is a real opportunity missed. Here too the fundamental article of W. Schmid in *RAC* vol. 5 is in no way replaced.

GOULET-CAZÉ (2720-2833): another excellent article of monographic proportions, giving a valuable overview of Imperial cynicism. At 2788-2800 the relations with early Christianity are discussed, with particular attention to the two figures who in the view of the author may be said to have been cynics and Christians at the same time: Peregrinus in the 2nd century, and Maximus in the 4th. The subject of the relation

between cynicism and the New Testament, which has much occupied New Testament scholars recently, is not discussed (but there are some references in the extensive bibliography).

HAMMERSTAEDT (2834-2865): of interest here is the Christian use of Oenomaus' sharp critique of oracular practice (2862-2864).

BRISSON (2867-2931): the important evidence on Orphism in Athenagoras and the Clementine *Recognitiones* is analysed at some length (2898-2910, with translations of the central texts). The summary of Jewish and Christian reactions—some along negative lines, other positive—to Orphism on 2927 is no more than a sketch, which it would be interesting for the author to develop more fully elsewhere.

MANSFELD (3056-3229): from the viewpoint of patristic philosophy this article (if that be the word for such a long contribution) is unquestionably the highlight of the two *Teilbände.* Taking as his starting-point a number of doxographical texts on the nature and structure of the soul and its rational part, the ἡγεμονικόν, in the obscure late 1st century A.D. doxographer Aëtius, Mansfeld traces the scholastic background of this kind of literature, which has its origin in the practice of dialectic in the early Peripatetic tradition, but was taken over and developed by a broad range of authors from other schools and backgrounds. Mansfeld's total mastery of the ancient sources and the modern secondary literature is quite unsurpassed. Patristic authors dealt with in more or less detail are: Ambrose, Augustine, Calcidius, Clement (esp. his dialectical discussion in *Stromata* VIII), Eusebius, Nemesius, Philoponus, Ps. Justin, Tertullian, Theodoret. Also Philo of Alexandria is a vital witness in the chain that leads from Aëtius back to Aristotle (esp. in the 'sceptical' doxographies on the heaven and the soul in *Somn.* 1.21-33). What is so refreshing is the *way* that the evidence from the Church Fathers is treated. It emerges that Patristic authors have an eye for the sceptical use of dialectical doxographical arguments: "The Christian authors who provide much material relating to or deriving from the 'Placita' imitated the Skeptics insofar <as> they insisted on the disagreement among their pagan opponents; their attitude resembles that of the Dogmatists, however, in that they have an axe to grind (3064)." Patristic writers are thus fully integrated into the investigation as no more and no less than one highly important thread of the fascinating web. They *can* be integrated into it because they themselves were equally well integrated into the scholastic method of doing philosophy and using philosophical arguments for one's own ends which was so deeply

embedded into later ancient Greco-Roman culture. Seldom will one encounter such a fascinating example of the interpenetration of *Antike* and *Christentum*.

With this positive note I bring my review of these two splendid tomes to a close. I had just finished the review when parts 5 & 6 arrived in the post. There has been, I now read, a change of plan. These parts will not conclude the volume after all. Part 7 is still to follow. I hope to review the three remaining parts in this journal in due course. But at this point it is the words of the folksong that come to mind: *when will it ever end, when will it ever end?*

NL-3762 VA *Soest*, Pelikaanweg 7 D.T. RUNIA

Barbara Nichtweiss, *Erik Peterson, Neue Sicht auf Leben und Werk*. Herder, Freiburg, 1992. 966 pp.

Erik Peterson (Hamburg 1890-Hamburg 1960), one of the most competent historians of the 20th century, was largely ignored by the Protestant establishment after his conversion in 1931 to Roman Catholicism. Therefore this solid and excellent biography is most welcome.

The authoress had access to letters, diaries and unpublished manuscripts of this melancholic genius, which are preserved in Torino, and so can offer not only interesting new material, but also a complete and updated history of the reception of his ideas. She shows that Peterson, who was a pupil of Richard Reitzenstein in Göttingen, long before others saw that the latter's (and Rudolph Bultmann's) Aryan myth of the saved saviour was an unsavoury hoax. I add that P. became familiar with the work of Gershom Scholem only in 1948-1949, when I lend him my copy of *The Maior Trends of Jewish Mysticism*. This lonely scholar also discerned at an early date the importance of Judaic Christianity and Encratism. He failed to see, however, that the latter, as represented by the opponents of "Paul" in the Pastoral Letters to Timothy and Titus, had links with the Hellenized Judaism of Alexandria and Philo, whereas the Palestino-Syrian Christians of the pseudo-Clementines, who favoured marriage, were just as primitive as these Encratites. His rediscovery of asceticism was idiosyncratic. And yet he was right in stressing that the Christian religion from the very beginning was ascetic: is not monogamous marriage, condoned by the Church, a form of asceticism?

Miss Nichtweiss also discusses in some detail Peterson's remarkable view that the martyrer is a witness for the truth of the Roman Catholic dogma (in his study *Zeuge der Wahrheit*). Some may think that this only shows how ingenuous and onesided he was: what about the martyrers of the Church to which your reviewer belongs? Did not they vanquish the absolute state just as well as their counterparts in the Early Church? And what about the Cathars of Southern France? And about the Manichaean Christians, more persecuted than adherents of any other religion, included Roman Catholicism? On the other hand, P.'s view that Christ has overcome the "angels of the nations" and made impossible every form of nationalism (not just German nationalism, of course) seems to be most relevant for our times.

Miss Nichtweiss has collected almost all facts and memories about the tragic life of this great man. Let me add just one anecdote. On my flight from Egypt in the autumn of 1956 the good American warship Thuban brought us from Alexandria to Napels. From there we traveled to Rome and I contacted my old colleague. I found Peterson still vexed with the same problems as in 1948-1949, when we met each other regularly. He had read in the newspapers about the discovery of the Gospel of Thomas and asked me whether it contained Encratite material. I then said: "No".

The correct answer is: "Yes".

3722 BR *Bilthoven*, N. Houdringlaan 32 GILLES QUISPEL

R. van den Broek, T. Baarda, and J. Mansfeld (edd.), *Knowledge of God in the Graeco-Roman World* (E.P.R.O., 112). Leiden-New York-København-Köln, E. J. Brill, 1988. 290 p. 112,— guilders.

Contents. G. Mussies, Identification and Self-Identification of Gods in Classical and Hellenistic Times; P. W. van der Horst, The Unknown God (Acts 17:23); M. Baltes, Zur Theologie des Xenokrates; D. T. Runia, Naming and Knowing: Themes in Philonic Theology with special Reference to the *De mutatione nominum*; J. Mansfeld, Compatible Alternatives: Middle Platonist Theology and the Xenophanes Reception; P. L. Donini, La connaissance de dieu et la hiérarchie chez Albinos; M. E. Stone, The Way of the Most High and the Injustice of God in 4 Ezra; P. W. van Boxel, Man's Behaviour and God's Justice in Early Jewish Tradition. Some observations; J.-P. Mahé, Générations antédiluviennes et chute des éons dans l'Hermétisme et dans la Gnose; T. Baarda, "If you do not sabbatize the Sabbath...": The Sabbath as God or World in Gnostic Understanding (Ev. Thom. Log. 27); R. van den Broek,

Eugnostus and Aristides on the Ineffable God; J. M. Dillon, The Knowledge of God in Origen; G. C. Stead, Knowledge of God in Eusebius and Athanasius; R. Turcan, Les dieux et le divin dans les mystères de Mithra; M. Tardieu, La conception de Dieu dans le Manichéisme. Indexes.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106 J. C. M. VAN WINDEN

BOOKS RECEIVED

The inclusion of a book in this list, which contains all books received by the editors, does not guarantee its subsequent review.

Pseudo-Basilius, Adversus Eunomium IV-V. Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kommentar von Franz Xaver Risch (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 16). Leiden-New York-London, Brill, 1992. 234 p.

Apponius, Die Auslegung zum Lied der Lieder. Die einführenden Bücher I-III und das christologisch bedeutsame Buch IX, eingeleitet, übersetzt und kommentiert von Hildegard König (Vetus Latina. Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 21). Freiburg, Herder, 1992. 112* + 302 S.

Umberto Mattioli (ed.), La donna nel pensiero cristiano antico. Casa editrice Marietti, Via Palestro 10/8, 16122 Genova. 1992. 399 p. L. 45.000.

La chaîne sur la Genèse. Édition intégrale I: chapitres 1 à 3, texte établi par Françoise Petit (Traditio exegetica graeca 1). Lovanii, In aedibus Peeters, 1992. XXXVII, 340 p. 3800,— BEF.

Ingeborg Tiemann, Die Deutung des Minotaurus von den ältesten Quellen bis zum frühen Mittelalter. Diss. Utrecht 1992.

Anonymi Glosa Psalmorum ex Traditione Seniorum. Teil I: Praefatio und Psalmen 1-100. Herausgegeben von Helmut Boese (Vetus Latina. Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 22). Freiburg, Herder, 1992. 32* + 471 S.

Baraita de-Melekhet ha-Mishkam. A Critical Edition with Introduction and Translation by Robert Kirschner (Monographs of the Hebrew Union College 15). Hebrew Union College Press. 3101 Clifton Av., Cincinnati, Ohio 45220, 1992. 318 p. (The only systematic rabbinic exegesis of the tabernacle account to emerge from late antiquity or the Middle Ages).

Samuel N. C. Lieu, Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China (Wiss.Unters.Z.N.T.). Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1992.

Jacques Berchtold, Des Rats et des Ratières. Anamorphoses d'un champ métaphorique de saint Augustin à Jean Racine (Histoire des idées et critique literaire, vol. 311). Genève, Librairie Droz S.A., 11, rue Massot, 1992.

Origenes, In Lucam Homiliae/Homilien zum Lukasevangelium. Lateinisch, Griechisch, Deutsch. 2 Bände. Übersetzt und eingeleitet von Hermann-Josef Sieben s.j. (Fontes Christiani 4/1-2). Herder, Freiburg usw., 1992. 520 S. DM 46.00 + 39.00.

Cyrill von Jerusalem, Mystagogicae Catecheses/Mystagogische Katechesen. Griechisch, Deutsch. Übersetzt und eingeleitet von Georg Röwekamp (Fontes Christiani 7). Herder, Freiburg usw., 1992. 197 S. DM 32.00.

Grégoire de Nazianze, Discours 42-43. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Jean Bernardi (Sources Chrétiennes 384). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992. 326 p. 226 F.

Javier Teixidor, Bardesane d'Edesse. La première philosophie syriaque (Patrimoines. Christianisme). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992. 160 p. 150 F.

The Gnostic Jung. Including "Seven sermons to the Dead". Selected and introduced by Robert A. Segal. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. 259 p.

Recherches et tradition. Mélanges patristiques offerts à Henri Crouzel, s.j., sous la direction d'André Dupleix (Théologie Historique 88). Paris, Beauchesne, 1992. XII, 366 p. 240 FF.

François Heim. La théologie de la victoire. De Constantin à Théodose (Théologie Historique 89). Paris, Beauchesne, 1992. XV, 347 p. 270 FF.

Lucile Villey, Soumission. Thème et variations aux temps apostoliques. La fonction d'une préposition ὑπό (Théologie Historique 91). Paris, Beauchesne, 1992. 530 p. 198 FF.

Paul Aubin, Plotin et le christianisme. Triade plotinienne et Trinité chrétienne (Bibliothèque des archives de philosophie. Nouvelle série 55). Paris, Beauchesne 1992. 238 p. 180 FF.

Charles Pietri, Historien et Chrétien. Préface de Philippe Levillain, Postface de Jean-Robert Armogathe. Paris, Beauchesne, 1992. VIII. 221 p. 120 FF. (Recueil d'articles de Charles Pietri parus dans *Les Quatre Fleuves*).

Jeremy Driscoll, OSB, The 'Ad Monachos' of Evagrius Ponticus. Its Structure and a Select Commentary (Studia Anselmiana 104) Roma, 1991. XV, 432 p.

Origène, Commentaire sur Saint Jean. Tome V (Livres XXVIII, XXXII). Texte grec, introduction, traduction et notes par Cécile Blanc (Sources Chrétiennes 385). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992. 392 p. 324 F.

Didyme l'Aveugle, Traité du Saint Esprit. Introduction, texte critique, traduction, notes et index par Louis Doutreleau, s.j. (Sources Chrétiennes 386). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992. 450 p. 166 F.

Salvatore Pricoco, Monaci, Filosofi e Santi. Saggi di storia della cultura tardoantica (Armarium.Biblioteca di storia e cultura religiosa 1). Rubbettino, 1992 (Viale dei Pini, 8, 88049 Soveria Manelli). 395 p. L. 35.000.

Adolfo Amadeo, Gesù il Nazareo. Nuova edizione e saggio introduttivo di Francesco Erasmo Sciuto (Armarium 2). Rubbettino, 1992. 188 p. L. 20.000.

Franzo Migliore, Introduzione al Nuovo Testamento. Presentazione di Bruno Corsari (Armarium 3). Rubbettino, 1992. 309 p. L. 30.000.

Ambrosius von Mailand, Der Tod — ein Gut (De bono mortis). Übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen versehen von Josef Huhn (Christliche Meister 44). Johannes Verlag Einsiedeln, Freiburg, 1992. 92 S. (kleines Format). DM 18,—.

Alexandre Faivre, Ordonner la fraternité. Pouvoir d'innover et retour à l'ordre dans l'Église ancienne. Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf 1992. 555 p. 299 F.

Joseph Kardinal Ratzinger und Peter Henrici, Credo. Ein theologisches Lesebuch. Köln, Communio, 1992. 398 S.

Barbara Nichtweiss, Erik Peterson. Neue Sicht auf Leben und Werk. Freiburg-Basel-Wien, Herder, 1992. XVII, 966 S.

Vigiliae Christianae 47 (1993), 105-118, E. J. Brill, Leiden

HERACLEON, ORIGEN, AND THE TEXT OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

BY

BART D. EHRMAN

The meager facts about Heracleon's life are well known and can be easily summarized.[1] He was a disciple of Valentinus, or perhaps his intimate.[2] Along with Ptolemaeus he was known to be a leader of the Italic or Western branch of Valentinian Christianity.[3] In view of these associations, he is generally thought to have been active around the year 170, or perhaps a bit earlier, possibly in Rome.[4] Above all, he was remembered for his exegetical works on the emerging New Testament; he is reputed to have been the first to produce a commentary on the Fourth Gospel.[5]

We are ill informed concerning the structure and scope of this "commentary." It is fragmentarily preserved in the comments of Origen, and virtually nowhere else.[6] There is in fact little to suggest that Heracleon had prepared a full verse-by-verse exposition: Origen does not mention him until Book II of his own Commentary, and here it is in connection with his exposition of John 1:3 (*Jo.Com* II, 100).[7] Moreover, Origen elsewhere covers considerable territory without mentioning Heracleon's views—somewhat odd if in fact his opponent had provided a full commentary.[8] As a consequence, some scholars have plausibly suggested that Heracleon's "commentary" was an annotated copy of the Gospel or perhaps random notes on passages of particular interest.[9]

Given Origen's relatively sporadic discussion of Heracleon, it would probably be going too far to say that his own thirty-two volume work, left uncompleted, was preeminently meant to offer a rebuttal.[10] At the same time, when Origen does mention his opponent, he makes it abundantly clear where he differs from him (as well as where he agrees), and expends some considerable effort in showing the inferiority of his exegesis.[11] Scholars have always recognized this "reactionary" character of Origen's work. What they have not recognized is the degree to which Origen's disagreements with Heracleon relate not simply to vary-

ing theological assumptions about the text, but to divergent forms of the text itself. Indeed, a number of their exegetical differences relate closely to their use of variant textual traditions: to some degree, their exegesis of John differs because the wording of their Johannine texts differs.[12]

The raw data are these: in the surviving fragments Heracleon cites the Gospel of John nearly fifty times.[13] In more than one out of five instances (11/49 total) Heracleon appears to attest a different form of the text from that known to Origen.[14] Of these, over half (6/11) are instances in which their different interpretations of the text depend to some extent on the variant forms of its wording. Thus in almost one out of every eight verses cited by Heracleon, the divergent wording of the text has played some role in the exegesis.[15]

The viability of these data can be illustrated by several instances in which the exegesis does *not* appear to have been at stake. There are three citations of John 4:17b in Origen's surviving writings. In two of the three, Jesus is said to reply to the Samaritan woman, "You have said rightly, 'I do not have a husband'" (οὐκ ἔχω ἄνδρα).[16] In only the third quotation does Origen mention the text in order to explain Heracleon's interpretation. Notably, here Jesus' words are somewhat different, as they are put in indirect discourse, "You have said truly that you do not have a husband" (οὐκ ἔχεις ἄνδρα).[17] One might be tempted to see in this final quotation a simple paraphrase, made perhaps by Origen himself. It is nonetheless striking that the verse is worded in precisely this way in a significant stream of the textual tradition of the Fourth Gospel. This is the text preserved in the "Western" codices Bezae and Sinaiticus (the latter of which is Western in the first eight chapters of John)[18] as well as in the Latin tradition. It appears then to be a genuine variant reading, attested differently in Heracleon and Origen.

A similar situation occurs seven verses later in Jesus' words to the Samaritan woman "God is Spirit, and those who worship him (τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτόν) must worship in spirit and in truth." Origen gives precise citations of the verse in five places, three times in the *Contra Celsum* and twice in the Commentary on John. Four of the citations are exactly the same.[19] The exception is the second quotation from the Commentary, which again is the only one for which Origen presents Heracleon's interpretation.[20] In this final instance, he omits the third person pronoun, so that the verse now reads "God is Spirit, and those who worship (τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας) must worship in spirit and in truth." Again one might suspect that Origen has given the passage in a slightly

modified form for unknown reasons. What is striking, however, is that the pronoun is also missing from the leading representatives of the Western text as well (the first hands of D and ℵ).

As a brief third example, Origen cites John 4:37 on two occasions. The first agrees with the vast majority of MSS: "In this the word is true" (ὁ λόγος ἐστὶν ἀληθινός).[21] The other differs simply in the matter of word order (ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος for ὁ λόγος ἐστίν).[22] Notably, this second instance is the text that Origen has drawn from Heracleon; again, this form of the text agrees with leading representatives of the Western tradition (thus D a b).

These are instances, then, in which Heracleon appears to attest a form of text that is otherwise preserved in the textual tradition of the NT, even though it was not known to, or at least not used by, Origen. In all three of these instances Heracleon's text supports the so-called Western tradition; in none of them has any exegetical issue been at stake.[23]

Exegesis does enter into the picture in several other texts, however, and these are to serve as the object of our primary concern. One of the most striking comes in Origen's interpretation of John 1:21. Origen objects to Heracleon's construal of this verse by claiming that he had not attended closely to its wording. As it stands, the objection appears odd, given Heracleon's remarkable attentiveness to textual detail elsewhere.[24] Nonetheless, according to Origen, when John the Baptist answers the Levites and Priests that he is neither the Christ nor the prophet, Heracleon fails to observe the repetition of the article and so mistakenly thinks that John denies being "a" prophet rather than "the" (messianic) prophet.[25] This disregard for the words of the text, maintains Origen, is what leads to Heracleon's fantastic explanation of why Jesus elsewhere calls John a prophet when the Baptist himself denies it.[26]

For our purposes it should be noted that Origen cites the passage a total of eight times in his extant writings, seven times with the article. The only exception is the paraphrase of Heracleon's position. What must not escape our attention, however, is that there is a stream of the NT textual tradition that also lacks the article. In this instance, of course, the Latin witnesses are of no assistance (since Latin has no article); moreover, and regrettably, one of the two leading representatives of the Western tradition (codex Bezae) happens to be lacunose in this part of John. But Codex Sinaiticus, the other leading Western witness, is extant; remarkably, it stands virtually alone against all other witnesses

in reading the shorter form of the text.[27] Origen may well have attacked Heracleon for failing to observe an article that was not present in his text of John.

Staying for the moment with the traditions about the Baptist, we do well to reflect on the textual situation of John 1:26, where John observes, "In your midst is standing one whom you do not know." According to Origen, Heracleon interpreted the verse to mean that, in Jesus, the Savior is now present in the world; from this Origen concludes that Heracleon did not recognize any earlier presence of the Savior.[28] Origen rejects this interpretation, insisting that the Logos had been in the world since creation, and could be found among the people of God throughout their history. He finds evidence for his position in Isaiah and the Psalms.

This debate centers on the *time* of the Savior's presence in the world, a question related to the verb tense used by the Baptist. Does he say that the Savior "is now standing" among them (present tense, στήκει, as in Heracleon's view?) or that he "has stood" among them (perfect tense, ἕστηκεν, as in Origen's)? Interestingly enough, the question relates closely to the textual tradition of the verse: throughout our surviving MSS of John 1:26, the verb fluctuates between the present tense and the perfect, with the present found among Western witnesses and several others,[29] the perfect virtually everywhere else. What is peculiar in this instance is the pattern of Origen's own citations. In all, Origen quotes the passage sixteen times. In the early part of the Commentary on John, i.e. in Book Two, written in Alexandria, and Book Six, written soon after his move to Caesarea (and in which he spurns Heracleon's exegesis), he cites the verb in the perfect tense virtually without fail (10 out of 11 times).[30] The only exception is his quotation of Heracleon, where the present tense coincides with Heracleon's interpretation of the verse.[31] Curiously, when Origen cites the verse later in his career, viz. in the *Contra Celsum* (three times) and in the final volume of the John Commentary (twice), he gives the verb in the present tense.[32]

What are we to make of these data? Heracleon appears to have known and interpreted a form of the text that is still preserved in some of the Old Latin witnesses and several other MSS. Early in his career, up to and including the time he wrote his rebuttal in Book Six of his Commentary, Origen appears to have known only the other form of the text. His own text ("in your midst *has stood* one whom you do not know") makes Heracleon's exegesis appear forced, and allows Origen

to charge him (implicitly) with failing to recognize the significance of the tense. Ironically, it appears that some years later, long after he had written his attack on Heracleon, Origen himself acquired a MS of the Fourth Gospel in which the verb of 1:26 was given in the present tense.

Other instances of divergent traditions occur in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel. As we have already observed, Origen first mentions Heracleon in conjunction with his exegesis of John 1:3. Heracleon had interpreted the words, "Apart from him was nothing made," to refer to the creation of the world and everything in it, but *not* "to the things outside of the cosmos and the creation." In other words, the "all things" that came into being through the Logos (v. 3a) did not include the divine Pleroma, which preceded it.[33]

Origen argues, to the contrary, that all things were indeed made through Christ, including the entire spiritual realm. He makes his point, in part, by emphasizing that when the text says "apart from him, not even one thing came into being," it really means "not even one thing" (οὐδὲ ἕν). This emphatic statement is buttressed by the strong wording of Origen's text of John, found consistently in all of his own quotations of 1:3. In conformity with the majority of MSS of the Fourth Gospel, Origen cites the text eight times as χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν.[34]

It should be noted that he preserves the same form of text even when he summarizes Heracleon's position. On a later occasion, however, Origen explicitly cites Heracleon's wording of the passage in order to explain his exegesis of John 4:24.[35] In *this* context the text reads χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδέν. What we cannot fail to notice here is that this form of text is also found in the two Western uncials of John 1:3 (ℵ* and D), along with one of our earliest papyri witnesses, P^{66}, and fam^1 and Irenaeus.

In this instance in particular we are justified in asking which of our two authors preserves the earlier form of the text.[36] Heracleon's form is supported by a remarkable confluence of early and diverse witnesses: the best Western MSS, one of the earliest Alexandrian, and an assortment of others. Since it is attested by Irenaeus as well, the reading can be dated to a point prior to the production of any of our MSS with text.[37] The plausibility that this form of the verse antedates the other is heightened when we consider that Origen's more emphatic form (οὐδὲ ἕν, which for Origen means *not even one thing*) works particularly well for his own position. The sheer convenience of this wording makes one suspect, on transcriptional grounds, that it actually represents a slight

scribal corruption effected for polemical reasons—it makes Heracleon (and those like him) look particularly foolish to say "apart from him was made not even one thing ... except some things."

Is it conceivable that proto-orthodox scribes would have slightly altered their sacred texts for polemical gain? It is not only conceivable, it is patent that they did, in far more telling and blatant cases than the present.[38] What is intriguing about this particular instance is that the change could be effected so readily—simply by the repetition of an epsilon—and that the result is merely a heightening of the nuance, rather than a transformation of the sense.[39] Here we might say then, that the *origin* of the corruption of οὐδέν to οὐδὲ ἕν in John 1:3 appears to lie, if not with Origen himself, then in proto-orthodox controversies with Christian Gnostics that were transpiring in his day.[40]

An even more complicated textual situation occurs at the end of the Prologue in John 1:18. The general problems that surround this verse are particularly thorny, and do not need to deter us at this point.[41] There can be little doubt, in any case, about Origen's own form of the text: "The unique God (ὁ μονογενὴς θεός) who is in the bosom of the Father, that one has made him known." He quotes the passage this way in the two clearest citations of the John Commentary,[42] and in five of his seven adaptations or allusions to the verse in the Commentary and in the *Contra Celsum*.[43] In only one clear citation of the verse does Origen omit the article with μονογενής; perhaps not coincidentally, this is the one instance in which he is discussing Heracleon's interpretation of the verse.[44]

If Heracleon's text indeed lacked the article, it would have stood in good company: the one leading representative of the Western text that is extant here, codex Sinaiticus, reads μονογενὴς θεός,[45] as do leading representatives of the generally superior Alexandrian tradition (P^{66} B C* and L). Is this an earlier form of the text? If so, the strengthening of the phrase through the addition of the article would make some sense: Christ is now said to be absolutely unique, he is not simply one of the aeons of the Pleroma. Conceivably, Origen's text has arisen from the ashes of anti-gnostic polemics.[46]

But that is not all. On one other occasion Origen refers to Heracleon's interpretation of John 1:18, citing it in a form that has appeared truncated to most of his editors and translators. In Book Six of this Commentary Origen objects to Heracleon's opinion that the Evangelist rather than John the Baptist uttered the words of v. 18. He points out

that, contrary to Heracleon's view, the Baptist and even some of his predecessors received the full benefit of the revelation of the μονογενής:[47] (literally) "for not now for the first time has he explained unto the bosom of the father" (οὐ γὰρ νῦν πρῶτον ἐξηγήσατο εἰς τὸν κολπὸν τοῦ πατρός). Given the unusual phrasing, it is not surprising to find Preuschen, followed by Blanc, emending Origen's text by reinserting the clause that appears at first glance to have inadvertently dropped out. The "restored" text reads οὐ γὰρ νῦν πρῶτον ἐξηγήσατο <ὁ ὤν> εἰς τὸν κολπὸν τοῦ πατρός "for not now for the first time did the one who is in the bosom of the Father make [him] known.[48]

The emendation is certainly possible, but it overlooks a significant datum. Elsewhere in the textual tradition of the Fourth Gospel there are MSS that lack the clause ὁ ὤν. Specifically, it is missing in the Western tradition of the verse, as attested in codex Sinaiticus and the Old Latin MS a. Is it possible that Heracleon's text lacked not only the article before μονογενής but also the participial clause? If so, then interpreters have consistently misconstrued Heracleon's exegesis. For him the text does not function christologically, as it does for Origen, in stating something about the identity of the μονογενής. Instead, it functions soteriologically to indicate the effect of his revelation. That is to say, Heracleon's text does not indicate that the Logos *is in* the bosom of the Father, it says that the Logos explains "unto" the bosom of the Father. For Heracleon, this would mean that Christ's revelation elevates the pneumatics into the bosom of the Father. That this was indeed Heracleon's construal of the verse is suggested by Origen's rebuttal, for he proceeds to argue that in fact the coming of the Logos in Christ is not its first appearance, since even Abraham—i.e., not one of Heracleon's *pneumatikoi*—encountered the revelation and experienced its benefits.

In sum, Heracleon explained the verse soteriologically to show how one comes into the bosom of the Father. Origen, on the other hand, interprets it christologically, to explain the nature of the Logos. Here again it appears that these two exegetes did not simply differ over the correct interpretation of the words of the text. To some degree, they disagreed over the words of the text themselves.

Something similar may perhaps be said concerning the text of John 1:4. In this case, unfortunately, we cannot be certain that Origen has actually cited Heracleon's form of the passage.[49] What we do know is that Heracleon understood the phrase "What was in him was life," to

mean that "life" is found within the "*pneumatikoi*," who realize their true essence when they encounter the revelation in Christ. Among other things, this means that Heracleon did not refer the verse to Christ *per se*; he understood it chiefly in reference to the present reality of those who have the divine seed within them: in them "is" life.

Here we must observe that this exegesis would make particular sense if Heracleon's text of John 1:4 did not read ἐν αὐτῷ ζώη ἔστιν ("in him *is* life").[50] Interestingly, Origen himself acknowledges that this reading appears "in some copies" of the Fourth Gospel.[51] What is particularly intriguing is that among the copies that have survived, those of the so-called Western tradition (ℵ D OL) consistently read the present tense. Perhaps the fact that the text presupposed by Heracleon's exegesis is preserved within the tradition that he otherwise appears to attest is not altogether accidental. Here again one might suppose that his exegetical difference from Origen is in some way related to the differences between their MSS of the Gospel.

In only one instance does Origen explicitly attribute a difference in interpretation to a difference in text. Ironically, this is also the only instance in which none of our surviving MSS has preserved Heracleon's reading. As if taking the text for granted, Heracleon remarks that the Samaritan woman's *six* husbands represent the material realm into which she has fallen, the number six being representative of matter and, therefore, of evil.[52] Origen disallows Heracleon's construal, in part because his own MSS of the Fourth Gospel state that the Samaritan woman had five husbands, not six. Yvonne Janssens has argued that Heracleon actually does not preserve a divergent textual tradition: if one counts the woman's present husband, along with the five in her past, she has in fact had six.[53] The difficulty with this suggestion is that Origen presents his disagreement with Heracleon not by summarizing his opponent's construal (e.g., by saying, "Heracleon claims that she had six husbands") but by actually quoting Heracleon's form of Jesus' words: "We find in Heracleon [the words], 'You have had six husbands'." This appears, then, to be a textual discrepancy pure and simple, one that proved particularly useful for Heracleon's exegesis.

That there could be such a discrepancy should by now come as no surprise, given the other data we have considered. It may be a matter of pure serendipity that the few MSS that have survived from the early centuries do not preserve the reading. On the other hand, Janssen's intuitions are surely correct to the extent that there is little in what we have

examined to suggest that Heracleon himself felt any need to modify his text in light of his interpretation. He may well have done so on occasion—we will never know—but more typically he appears rather to have paid close attention to the details of the text and to have gotten whatever mileage he could out of them in light of his entire theological and hermeneutical system.[54] Thus, in this particular instance as well, it seems reasonable to assume that he simply cited and interpreted the text as he found it in his copy of the Fourth Gospel.

What conclusions can we draw from this accumulation of data? They would prove particularly significant for NT textual critics if we could determine beyond reasonable doubt where Heracleon produced his work. As intimated at the outset of the study, his association with the mature Valentinus and with Ptolemaeus, and in particular his reputation of heading an Italic school of Valentinian Christians, may well be taken to suggest that he lived and worked in the capital city. If so, this would make his clear agreements with the so-called "Western" tradition especially noteworthy: here we would have an independent witness to the transmission of this form of text in Rome itself during the second half of the second century.[55]

These data are significant in other ways for those who are more generally interested in the history of the interpretation of the NT, as they show how exegesis in the early church related in some measure to the wild fluctuations of the text during the course of its transmission. In the fragmentary materials that survive, over twenty percent of Heracleon's citations of the Fourth Gospel differ textually from Origen's; of these differences, over half have some bearing on their respective exegeses.[56]

This is not at all to say that the form of text each exegete encountered played a determinative role in his exegesis. Quite to the contrary, as we know from reading the works of Origen and his gnostic predecessors, the appeal to a spiritual level of meaning could be used to render a so-called "literal" (i.e. grammatico-historical) exegesis innocuous when it came to deciding what the text "really" meant. To many moderns—especially post-Enlightenment modernists—this might suggest that interpreters can use figurative modes of exegesis to make texts say anything they want them to say. It may be more accurate, however, to say that all interpreters, even the Enlightened, have assumptions and perspectives, and that these inevitably affect the way they approach and construe their texts. If the present study has not shown that the words

of the text determine its meaning, it has at least shown how the words of a text determine the rhetoric of exegesis, in that the kinds of arguments that an exegete—in this case, a Heracleon or an Origen—feels compelled to use to establish the meaning of a text, depend in some measure on the words that are found within the text.

Notes

[1] For a fuller account, see, e.g., A. E. Brooke, *The Fragments of Heracleon* (TextS 1.4; Cambridge: University Press, 1891) 31-41; a recent and briefer discussion can be found in C. Bammel, "Herakleon", *TRE* XV (1986) 54-57. See further the works cited in note 11 below.

[2] Depending on how one construes the initial description of Origen: τὸν Οὐαλεντίνου λεγόμενον εἶναι γνώριμον Ἡρακλέωνα (*Jo.Com* II, 100). (Here and throughout I refer to Origen's John Commentary according to Book and paragraph number, as these are provided in C. Blanc, *Origène: Commentaire sur Saint Jean* [*SC* 120, 157, 222, and 290; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1975-1982] and, for Books XX and XXXII, in E. Preuschen, *Der Johanneskommentar* [*GCS* 10; Leipzig, 1903].) Clement of Alexandria calls him the most famous representative of the Valentinian school: ὁ τῆς Οὐαλεντίνου σχολῆς δοκιμώτατος (*Stromateis* IV, 9). The earliest reference appears to be that of Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* II, 4, 1), who mentions him but once and in passing (in connection with Valentinus), suggesting perhaps that he had not yet established a prominent following of his own (contrast Ptolemaeus). See also Tertullian, *Adv. Val.* III, 4.

[3] Thus Hippolytus, *Refutatio* VI, 30.

[4] E. Pagels speaks offhandedly of his life in Alexandria (because his works were known by Clement and Origen?). So far as I can see, she gives no evidence (*The Johannine Gospel in Gnostic Exegesis: Heracleon's Commentary on John* [Nashville and New York: Abingdon, 1973] 57). For his residence in Rome, see below, p. 113.

[5] In addition to his comments on the Fourth Gospel, preserved almost exclusively by Origen, we have a relatively lengthy account of his exposition of Luke 12:8-11 preserved by Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis* IV, 9, reproduced by Brooke *Fragments*, 50-103.

[6] All of the extent remarks are collected in Brooke, *Fragments*, 50-103.

[7] Pagels plausibly argues that Heracleon did not comment on the opening two verses (*Johannine Gospel*, 47).

[8] In one place Origen observes that Heracleon did not comment on a passage (8:12-20)—presumably this is what he means by ὁ μέντοι γε Ἡρακλέων ἐκθέμενος τὴν περὶ τοῦ γαζοφυλακίου λέξιν οὐδὲν εἶπεν εἰς αὐτήν (*Jo.Com* XIX, 89). He may, on the other hand, have been thinking only of 8:20, which would mean that he simply decided not to discuss Heracleon's exegesis of the rest of the passage (or at least v. 19, which is where Book XIX begins). Elsewhere he refers to Heracleon's failure to comment on 4:32 (οὐδὲν δὲ εἰς τὴν λέξιν εἶπεν ὁ Ἡρακλέων, *Jo.Com* XIII, 225). In both instances, Origen mentions the fact because he wants to engage Heracleon on the verse that follows.

[9] See, e.g., the brief remarks of C. Blanc, *SC* 120.10; Yvonne Janssens, "L'épisode de la Samaritaine chez Héracléon," *Sacra Pagina* (BETL 17-18; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1959) 77;

and Karlfried Froehlich, "Bibelkommentare—Zur Krise einer Gattung," *ZTK* 84 (1987) 472.

[10] Although certainly, since he undertook this labor at the instigation of Ambrose, whom he had earlier converted away from Valentinianism, we might suspect that there was some implicit attempt to give the "true" interpretation of this Gospel in light of the interpretations commonly advanced among the Valentinians, for whom it happened to be the Gospel of choice.

[11] For insightful studies that attempt to present Heracleon's views on their own terms see esp. Barbara Aland, "Erwählungstheologie und Menschenklassenlehre: Die Theologie des Herakleon als Schlüssel zum Verständnis der christlichen Gnosis?" in *Gnosis and Gnosticism*, ed. Martin Krause (NHS 8; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977) 148-81; Yvonne Janssens, "Héracléon: Commentaire sur l'Evangile selon S. Jean," *Le Muséon* 72 (1959) 101-51; 277-99; E. Mühlenberg, "Wieviel Erlösungen kennt der Gnostiker Herakleon," *ZNW* 66 (1975) 170-93, and Pagels, *The Johannine Gospel*. For a recent comparative analysis, see esp. Jean-Michel Poffet, *La méthode exégétique d'Héracléon et d'Origène, Commentateurs de Jn4: Jésus, la Samaritaine et les Samaritains* (Fribourg: Universitaites Fribourge Suisse, 1985).

[12] Before demonstrating this thesis, I should say a word about the comprehensiveness of my data. These are drawn in their entirety from a larger study I have co-authored with Gordon D. Fee and Michael W. Holmes, *The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen* (NTGF, 3.1; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992). In this volume we have set forth every quotation of the Fourth Gospel in the surviving works of Origen, as well as all of the textually significant allusions. On the basis of these data we have reconstructed the probable character of Origen's MSS of John, and collated this reconstructed text against a range of Greek and Latin MSS so as to determine his textual affinities.

[13] The number does not include, of course, instances in which Heracleon refers to a passage that he does not actually cite (e.g., 1:25; 2:13, 20; 4:13, 19).

[14] The difficulties of ascertaining Heracleon's own wording of the text on the basis of Origen's partial citations can well be imagined. Are Heracleon's quotations of Scripture drawn from his own work or does Origen cite them in the form of text that he himself knew? Two data can help resolve this critical issue, data that in fact gave rise to the present study: (a) Origen otherwise appears to quote Heracleon's commentary *verbatim*, and (b) in a number of instances, Origen introduces these quotations with a Johannine passage (a verse, a part of a verse, or a word) that differs in some way from the form of the text that he clearly attests elsewhere. How can these data be accounted for? I assume that in these instances, at least, Origen reproduces not only Heracleon's exegesis but also the text on which this exegesis is based. I might add that the same is probably true, by and large, even where their forms of the text cannot be shown to differ (which we should expect to occur, after all, in a good number of instances). For possible exceptions, see notes 23 and 49 below.

[15] Of the verses in which Origen and Heracleon appear to attest the same form of the text, a total of fifteen are invariant or virtually invariant in the tradition otherwise (John 1:16, 23, 29; 2:12; 4:11, 22, 26, 36, 48, 50, 53; 5:45; 8:21, 22, 50). For the other twenty-four, leading textual witnesses of the Fourth Gospel attest one or more significant units of variation (John 1:17, 28; 2:14, 15, 17, 19; 4:14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 24, 27, 30, 34, 36, 38, 39, 40, 47, 49, 51; 8:43, 44). For a full listing of the data, see the apparatus in Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes, *Text of the Fourth Gospel*.

[16] *Jo.Com* XIII, 50; XIII, 52. For the use of the *lemmata* to establish Origen's text, see Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes, *Text of the Fourth Gospel.*

[17] *Jo.Com* XIII, 70.

[18] Demonstrated conclusively by Gordon D. Fee, "Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John: A Contribution to Methodology in Establishing Textual Relationships," *NTS* 15 (1968-69) 23-44.

[19] *Jo.Com* XIII, 122; *Cels.* II, 71; VI, 70; VII, 27.

[20] *Jo.Com* XIII, 147.

[21] *Jo.Com* XIII, 319.

[22] *Jo.Com* XIII, 324.

[23] A comparable situation occurs in Origen's citations of John 1:27. Six times he quotes the text as οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ἄξιος (*Jo.Com* II, 215 [with a slight change of word order, ἄξιος ἐγώ]; VI, 48, 153, 157, 185; *Mat.Com* XVII, 32); his seventh quotation derives from Heracleon (*Jo.Com* VI, 198) and omits the ἐγώ altogether. Interestingly, while this shorter text is attested by a number of Alexandrian witnesses ($P^{66, 75}$ C L 33 565), it is preserved in the "Western" tradition as well (i.e. in Codex Sinaiticus; D is not extant here). Here I should add that even though Origen presents this form of the text as Heracleon's, in his actual *exposition* of the passage Heracleon states that John the Baptist declared himself not to be "adequate" (ἱκανός) rather than not "worth" (ἄξιος). If this in fact was Heracleon's actual text, then he would have agreed with the early Alexandrian witnesses $P^{66 \text{ and } 75}$ against Origen and the rest of the textual tradition.

Finally, it should be noted that in Origen's two citations of John 4:42, he gives the text as διὰ τὴν λαλιάν σου (*Jo.Com* XIII, 180, 351), in agreement with P^{75} and B against virtually the rest of the tradition; when he cites Heracleon's form of the text, however, he gives the passage in the more commonly attested form (which is, of course, also that of the "Western" text) διὰ τὴν σὴν λαλιάν. Moreover, whereas Origen cites Heracleon's text with λαλιάν rather than μαρτυρίαν, it is patent from Heracleon's explanation of the verse that he read μαρτυρίαν (which, interestingly enough, happens to be the text of ℵ and D as well): οὗτοι οὐκέτι διὰ μόνην ἀνθρωπίνην μαρτυρίαν, ἀλλὰ δι' αὐτὴν τὴν ἀλήθειαν πιστεύουσιν. We can probably assume again, therefore, that that when Origen reproduced Heracleon's text, he inadvertently substituted the key word as himself remembered it. For another instance of this phenomenon, see note 49 below.

[24] His exegesis not infrequently turns on the author's choice of individual words, verbal inflections, and syntax; he is conscious of literary context and is keen to ask critical questions of the text. See further the comments in R. P. C. Hanson, *Allegory and Event: A Study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture* (Richmond VA: John Knox, 1959) 143-47 and, especially, Janssens, "Héracléon," 277-78.

[25] See *Jo.Com* VI, 92 and 115.

[26] *Jo.Com* VI, 112-118.

[27] In the first hand, along with MS 69.

[28] *Jo.Com* VI, 194-197.

[29] Viz., the Old Latin, the Alexandrian witnesses B and L, and fam^1. Codex Sinaiticus, oddly, reads εστηκει.

[30] *Jo.Com* II, 215 (*bis*); VI, 48, 153, 154, 155, 156, 188, 197, and 254 (the final reference is an allusion).

[31] *Jo.Com* VI, 194.

[32] *Cels*, II, 9 (*bis*); V, 12; *Jo.Com* XXXII, 378, 380.

[33] *Jo.Com* II, 100-101. When Origen claims that Heracleon shamelessly "adds" the words "of the things in the cosmos and the creation" to "apart from him was made nothing," (*Jn.Com* II, 100) he is not referring to an actual textual emendation but to the addition of an extrinsic *notion* to the text (*contra* Hanson, *Allegory and Event*, 145). A comparable situation arises in Origen's comments on Heracleon's interpretation of 4:42, "No longer do we believe on account of your testimony." According to Heracleon the verse *means* "on account of your testimony, alone," and in this sense he suggests that the word "alone" is missing (*Jo.Com* XIII, 363).

[34] The exact citations and close adaptations: *Jo.Com* II, 91, 100, 101, 105, 108, 131; VI, 188; *Dial.Heracl.* 1, 9.

[35] *Jo.Com* XIII, 118.

[36] As was the case with 1:26, of course, both Heracleon and Origen would well have taken their exegetical stands on *either* wording of the text. The point to be stressed, however, is that Origen's refutation is especially poignant given his form.

[37] With regard to the antiquity of the reading, we should also note that while Origen never explicitly quotes the text in this less emphatic form, he does appear to know of its existence. Before contending with Heracleon over the interpretation of the verse, he indicates that evil is "nothing," so that when "nothing" came into being "apart from him," that means that the Word is not responsible for the coming of evil into the world (*Jo.Com* VI, 99 and 107).

[38] For a full discussion of scribal alterations of theologically significant texts, see my study *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (New York: Oxford University, forthcoming).

[39] At least as the sense is interpreted by most modern commentators.

[40] This controversy also led to disputes concerning the punctuation of vv. 3 and 4 (viz. whether there should be a full stop *before* ὃ γέγονεν or *after*). This issue lies beyond the purview of our present discussion, however, as MSS in this early period were by and large not punctuated.

[41] See Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*. There I argue that the original form of the text was preserved outside of the Alexandrian witnesses, viz. ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός.

[42] *Jo.Com* II, 212 (written during his Alexandrian period) and XXXII, 264 (during his Caesarean).

[43] *Jo.Com* VI, 14 and 74; *Cels.* VII, 49; VIII, 1 and 17. The exceptions are too allusive to be of much use: *Cels.* II, 71 and VII, 43.

[44] Jo.Com VI, 13. As he is indicating the extent of the pericope here, one might plausibly think that he has simply truncated his reference for contextual reasons—i.e. that he is not trying to give an exact citation of the verse, but simply to indicate which verse he is referring to. At the same time, since he is in the midst of discussing Heracleon's interpretation, it is at least equally plausible that Heracleon's form of the text has in this instance come to influence him.

[45] In the first hand.

[46] I offer an alternative explanation of the textual data in *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*.

[47] For Heracleon, the psychic (represented by the John the Baptist, who is also an image of the Demiurge) does not have full knowledge of God, and yet is ignorant of this lack. Therefore, in his ignorance of his ignorance, the Baptist can scarcely say, "no one has

seen God at any time." Origen replies that if the Baptist had indeed "received grace upon grace," and confessed that "grace and truth come through Jesus Christ" (since Heracleon concedes that the Baptist spoke the words of 1:16-17), then he indeed must have acquired the full revelation of the one who is in the bosom of the Father (*Jo.Com* VI, 14).

[48] *Jo.Com* VI, 15.

[49] He discusses Heracleon's interpretation in *Jo.Com* II, 137, but focuses all of his attention on the meaning of ἐν αὐτῷ rather than the significance of the verb tense, which he gives, in conformity with all of his ten other citations, in the imperfect. We may be simply dealing here with a verse that was so familiar to Origen that he quotes it the way he had learned it, even when discussing Heracleon's exegesis. See further my article, "Heracleon and the 'Western' Textual Tradition," *NTS* (forthcoming). For similar instances, see the discussion of 1:27 and 4:42 in note 23 above.

[50] Origen's precise citations are found in *Jo.Com* I, 112, 223, 159; II, 112, 114, 128, 137, 143.

[51] *Jo.Com* II, 132.

[52] *Jo.Com* XIII, 71-72.

[53] "Héracléon," 135, n. 43. So too, more recently, Poffet, *La méthode exégétique*, 34, n. 69.

[54] See note 24 above.

[55] These few remarks must be seen as depending on the rather impressionistic impact of an initial study. The text-critical significance of these data can only be determined on the basis of a carefully controlled statistical analysis of their textual affinities, which I have now undertaken in a study entitled "Heracleon and the 'Western' Textual Tradition."

[56] Since the surviving portions of Origen's own work provides some limited evidence that he occasionally modified Heracleon's text into conformity with his own (see the discussions of John 1:27, 1:4, and 4:24 in notes 23 and 49 above), we might suppose that in reality the differences were even more wide-ranging than we can currently detect.

University of North Carolina at *Chapel Hill*

Vigiliae Christianae 47 (1993), 119-130, E. J. Brill, Leiden

PROVERBIA 6,3 UND DIE BRUDERLIEBE BEI DEN PACHOMIANERN

VON

CHRISTOPH JOEST

In zwei vorausgegangenen Veröffentlichungen[1] habe ich mich bemüht zu zeigen, daß die charakteristische Verbindung von Mönchtum und Nächstenliebe in Leben und Wirken des großen ägyptischen Koinobiarchen Pachom († 346) mit Notwendigkeit zu der Ausprägung des gemeinsamen kommunitären Lebens führte, für das er die neutestamentliche Bezeichnung *koinonia* in Anspruch nahm. Schon bei seinen Zeitgenossen, erst recht bei seinen Jüngern, galt er als Begründer und »Vater« des Koinobions.[2]

Das ägyptische Wüstenmönchtum als Hintergrund

Hintergrund dieser Pioniertat Pachoms war das eremitische und halberemitische Mönchtum der ägyptischen Wüste, was schon die Tatsache zeigt, daß er zunächst bei einem Anachoreten, bei Palamon, in die Lehre gegangen war.[3] Wie diese Wüstenväter und Wüstenmütter den charakteristischen Unterschied zwischen ihrem Leben und dem der *koinonia* empfanden, machen manche der von ihnen überlieferten *Apophthegmata* deutlich. So heißt es z. B. bei der Amma Synkletika: »Wenn wir in einem Koinobion sind, dann mußt du den Gehorsam der Askese vorziehen, denn die letztere lehrt Hochmut, der erstere Demut.« Auch ein anderes Wort wird von ihr überliefert: »Wenn wir im Koinobion sind, dürfen wir nicht das unsere suchen, noch der eigenen Meinung dienen, sondern dem gehorchen, der im Glauben unser Vater ist.«[4]

Für die Anachoreten schien also der Gehorsam das herausragende Unterscheidungsmerkmal zu sein.[5] Bei ihrer eremitischen Lebensweise hatten sie eine relative Freiheit. Sie konnten das Maß ihrer Askese, ihre *politeia*, selbst bestimmen; sie konnten den Aufenthaltsort wechseln, wenn ihnen das geraten schien; sie konnten für sich eine größere Einsamkeit oder eine größere Nähe zu den Brüdern wählen. Zwar suchten

sie sich häufig einen erprobten Altvater, den sie um Rat fragten, oder sie lebten sogar eine Zeit lang als Schüler bei einem bewährten Altvater mit, aber sie waren frei darin, *wen* sie wählen wollten, und sie konnten sich auch an verschiedene Väter wenden.[6] Die Haltung, in der sie das Wort solcher als Geistträger geltenden Greise[7] aufnahmen, hat man als *Führungsgehorsam* bezeichnet,[8] dessen Ziel darin besteht, daß der Jüngere schließlich selbst zu einem bewährten »Vater« wird, der dann keiner Anleitung mehr bedarf.[9]

Demgegenüber ist das Koinobion durch den *Ordnungsgehorsam* charakterisiert, der ein bleibendes Über- und Unterordnungsverhältnis zwischen dem Abt und dem Bruder beinhaltet.[10] Amma Synkletika hat in der Tat den Nagel auf den Kopf getroffen: Was für den Anachoreten die Askese ist, das ist für den Koinobiten der Gehorsam. Sich durch besondere asketische Leistungen hervorzutun hieße im Koinobion, aufzufallen und Aufmerksamkeit zu erregen.[11] Nicht umsonst haben die großen Väter gemeinsamen Lebens vor überzogener Askese gewarnt.[12] Die Askese des Koinobiten ist seine Einordnung, die Preisgabe des Eigenwillens, die bleibende Unterwerfung unter die Führung durch einen anderen, wie sie in der Wüstenspiritualität *so* nicht ausgeprägt wurde, so auch nicht ausgeprägt werden konnte oder ausgeprägt zu werden brauchte.

Das unterscheidend Pachomianische

Nun sah Pachom ohne Zweifel im Gehorsam eine der tragenden Säulen seiner *koinonia*. Das sahidische Fragment S^3 berichtet von einer Begebenheit ganz am Anfang des neuen Weges, den Pachom einschlagen wollte (der lückenhaft überlieferte Bericht kann aus dem Fragment S^1 ergänzt werden, das dieselben Ereignisse schildert). Einige Brüder hatten sich bei Pachom eingefunden, denen er in vorbildlicher Weise diente: er bestellte den Garten, bereitete ihnen das Essen, versorgte sie mit allem, was sie brauchten, pflegte die Kranken und empfing die Gäste.[13] Die Brüder fanden das lächerlich, wohl auch deshalb, weil es die Dienste des Niedrigsten waren und nicht die eines »Vaters« nach orientalischem Verständnis. So nahmen sie ihn bald nicht mehr ernst, machten sich über ihn lustig und vernachlässigten ihre Pflichten.[14] Nachdem er sie lange Zeit ertragen hatte, zog sich Pachom eine ganze Nacht zum Gebet zurück und trat am nächsten Morgen mit den Worten auf sie zu:

> Von jetzt ab werdet ihr in dem Augenblick, da man euch zum Gebet ruft, alle kommen; und ihr werdet euch mir gegenüber nicht mehr so betragen wie <sonst> jeden Tag ... In gleicher Weise werdet ihr in dem Augenblick, da man euch zum Essen ruft, zusammenkommen und euch nicht mehr so betragen wie <sonst> jeden Tag. Wenn es sich fügt, daß ihr mit einer für unsere eigenen Bedürfnisse notwendigen Arbeit beschäftigt sein sollt, dann werdet ihr alle gehen, und ihr werdet euch nicht mehr nachlässig verhalten wie ihr es bis heute getan habt. Wenn ihr den Regeln, die ich euch gegeben habe, nicht gehorchen wollt, seid ihr frei, denn »die Erde und alles, was sie enthält, ist des Herrn« (Ps 24,1); wenn ihr woanders hingeht, tut, was euch gut scheint. Denn ich werde euch nicht zurückhalten, wenn ihr nicht nach all den Regeln handelt, die ich euch gegeben habe.[15]

Auf den ersten Blick scheint es in diesem Abschnitt in der Tat um den Gehorsam zu gehen. Doch der eigentliche Kernpunkt liegt anderswo. Anlaß für die beschriebene Unbotmäßigkeit der Brüder war nämlich die dienende Liebe, die ihnen Pachom erwies. Dementsprechend heißt es zu Beginn des Berichtes:

> ... denn er sah, daß sie noch nicht geneigt waren, sich miteinander zur vollkommenen Gemeinschaft zu verbinden, zu der Art, wie in der Apostelgeschichte über die Glaubenden geschrieben ist: »Sie waren ein Herz und eine Seele, und alle Güter gehörten ihnen gemeinsam; es gab keinen, der von dem, was ihm gehörte, gesagt hätte: das ist mein«. Wie es auch der Apostel sagt: »Vergeßt nicht das Wohltun und die Gemeinschaft, denn das sind die Opfer der Art, die Gott gefallen.«[16]

Bezeichnend ist hierbei, daß Pachom offenbar die Liebe als das anspruchsvollere Ideal ansah, dem der Anfänger noch nicht gewachsen ist.[17] Er selbst dagegen verkörperte geradezu dieses Ideal und setzte es persönlich in die Praxis um. Was dabei sein Anliegen war, nämlich die gegenseitige brüderliche Liebe, wird durch die Erinnerung an die Jerusalemmer Urgemeinde deutlich gemacht.[18] Begrifflich prägnant und klar zeigt sich dieses Ideal in der Wahl des Wortes *koinonia* für die pachomianische Gemeinschaft (vgl. Apg 2,42).[19]

Nicht der Gehorsam, sondern die gegenseitige dienende Liebe waren also für den Gründer des Koinobitentums selbst das unterscheidende Wesensmerkmal seines Werkes.[20] In seinen Schriften kommt er mehrfach darauf zu sprechen und bemüht sich, in immer neuen Wendungen seinen Brüdern dieses Charakteristikum ihres Lebens einzuschärfen. Er tut dies, soweit wir das den uns erhaltenen Quellen entnehmen können, in Briefen und Katechesen, in denen er oft in freier Assoziation Bibelworte kombiniert und mit eigenen Worten zu einem kunstvollen Ganzen verwebt.

Prov 6,3 als Zusammenfassung der pachomianischen Berufung

Ein Schriftzitat scheint mir in besonderer Weise von Pachom verwendet zu werden, um mit aller Deutlichkeit dieses Grundanliegen auszudrücken: Proverbia 6,3c. Es lautet (nach der LXX): »Rüttle aber auch deinen Freund auf, für den du gebürgt hast.« Im Buch der Sprichwörter geht es hier darum, daß ein Vater seinen Sohn davor warnt, als Bürge für einen Freund einzutreten. Dahinter steht der orientalische Brauch, für einen in Not geratenen Mitbürger bei einem Gläubiger um Hilfe zu bitten und auf dessen Wunsch nach irgendeiner Sicherheit sich selbst als Bürgen anzubieten. Kommt nämlich der Schuldner seiner Zahlungspflicht nicht nach, kann dem Bürgen, falls er auch zahlungsunfähig ist, Sklaverei oder Schuldhaft drohen. Für einen solchen Fall spricht Prov 6,3 die Mahnung aus, den Freund, für den man gebürgt hat, aufzurütteln und zur Zahlung zu bewegen, um das eigene Leben zu retten.

An drei Stellen im pachomianischen Schrifttum stoßen wir nun auf dieses Zitat, zweimal bei Pachom selbst und ein drittes Mal bei seinem zweiten Nachfolger, Horsiesi († nach 387). Im folgenden sollen diese drei Stellen eingehender untersucht werden.

Der »Liber Orsiesii«

Beginnen wir mit Horsiesi. Er zitiert Prov 6,3 in dem sog. *Liber Orsiesii*, in dem er nach Art eines Vermächtnisses oder Testaments seinen Mitbrüdern die Grundanliegen der *koinonia*, wie er sie von ihrem geistlichen Vater »Apa Pachom« übernommen hatte, niederlegt und erläutert. Dort taucht unser Schriftverweis in Kapitel 9 auf, einem Abschnitt des sog. »Obernspiegel«,[21] der sich an die Oberen der verschiedenen Pachomianerklöster richtet und ihnen einschärft, daß sie Verantwortung für die ihnen anvertrauten Brüder haben und daß sie deshalb ihre Pflichten nicht vernachlässigen dürfen. Nachdem Horsiesi die Oberen zu gutem Beispiel verpflichtet und sie davor gewarnt hat, einzelnen Brüdern gegenüber aus Sympathie heraus nachsichtiger zu sein, als sie verdienen, mahnt er sie, daß sie, wenn sie von einem Bruder gekränkt werden, nicht sagen: »Was habe ich mit dem Zänker zu tun? Mag er doch tun, was er will, es läßt mich kalt. Ich mahne ihn nicht, und wenn er sich etwas zuschulden kommen läßt, weise ich ihn nicht zurecht. Ob er das Heil erlangt oder zugrunde geht — das interessiert mich nicht.«[22] Diese Gleichgültigkeit gegenüber dem Heil des Mitbruders bekämpft Horsiesi. Dazu führt er ein ganzes Arsenal von Schriftstellen an, die dem Obern

beweisen sollen, wie falsch diese Haltung ist. Zum ersten, so zeigt er, gilt es, zu vergeben und keinen Haß gegen den Bruder zu hegen; dazu erinnert er an die Vaterunserbitte Mt 6,12 und eine Ermahnung aus Lev 19,17.

Dann aber wendet sich Horsiesi direkt der Gleichgültigkeit zu, die am geistlichen Verderben des Bruders kein Interesse zeigt. Genau jetzt führt er als erstes Prov 6,3 auf: »Bestürme deinen Mitbürger, für den du dich verbürgt hast.« Unter dem Mitbürger ist hier dem Zusammenhang nach natürlich der Bruder zu verstehen, der den Oberen erzürnt hat. Dem Beleidigten soll es nicht gleichgültig sein, daß jener sich versündigte. Im Gegenteil: nachdem er in großzügiger Vergebung über die Beleidigung gegen seine Person hingweggesehen hat, soll er sich um das Heil des Bruders sorgen. Er soll ihn »bestürmen.« Die folgenden Bibelworte, die Horsiesi anführt, bekräftigen das noch: »Laß nicht ab, dein Kind zu züchtigen. Wenn du es mit der Rute schlägst, braucht es nicht zu sterben« (Prov 23,14 LXX), oder: »Du sollst deinen Nächsten ernstlich zurechtweisen, damit du seinentwegen keine Verschuldung auf dich lädst« (Lev 19,17).[23]

Zunächst deuten all diese Stellen darauf hin, daß es dem Obern nicht gleichgültig sein darf, wenn sich ein Bruder versündigt. Der zweite Teil von Prov 6,3 geht jedoch noch darüber hinaus. In unüberbietbarer Schärfe heißt es dort: »... für den du dich verbürgt hast.« Die Verbindlichkeit und Verpflichtung, sich das Heil des Bruders nicht egal sein zu lassen, könnte nicht deutlicher illustriert werden. Der Obere steht dafür ein, er haftet sozusagen vor Gott mit seinem Leben für das Leben des Bruders. Nicht nur, daß er sich um das Heil des Beleidigers sorgen soll, es geht in diesem seelsorgerlichen Bemühen auch um das eigene Heil, da er vor Gott für den Bruder haftet. Das wird durch das Bild der Bürgschaft ausgedrückt.

Freilich ist diese Stelle an die Oberen gerichtet, deren Fürsorgepflicht uns von vornherein einleuchtet. Auch Basileios d. Gr. spricht davon, daß dem Oberen Rechenschaft in Bezug auf das Heil seiner Brüder abverlangt werden wird. Er widmet diesem Thema das ganze Kapitel 25 seiner »Längeren Regeln«, aber er kommt darüber hinaus noch zwei Mal darauf zurück. So heißt es z.B. in LR 29: »Der Obere muß davon überzeugt sein, daß er sich heftigen und unausweichlichen Zorn zuziehen wird, wenn er seinem Bruder kein wirklicher Führer ist, denn dessen Blut wird von seiner Hand gefordert, wie geschrieben steht.«[24] Auch die *Regula Benedicti* spricht solche Ermahnungen an die Adresse des Abtes

aus. In Kap. 2,26 erinnert sie ihn an das Beispiel des Priesters Eli von Silo und führt in diesem Zusammenhang dasselbe Zitat aus Prov 23,14 an, das auch Horsiesi in Lib Ors 9 verwendet hat (s. o.). Etwas weiter unten heißt es dann bei Benedikt: »Vor allem darf er (der Abt) über das Heil der ihm Anvertrauten nicht hinwegsehen oder es geringschätzen ... Stets denke er daran: Er hat die Aufgabe übernommen, Menschen zu führen, für die er einmal Rechenschaft ablegen muß« (RB 2,33f).[25] Daß also die Oberen eine besondere Fürsorgepflicht für ihre Brüdern haben, ist einleuchtend, so daß Horsiesi zunächst in Lib Ors 9 nichts hervorstechend anderes zu sagen scheint, als man in dem Zusammenhang erwarten würde. Wie steht es aber mit den andern zwei Belegen?

Der dritte Brief Pachoms

In seinem 3. Brief mahnt Pachom angesichts des bevorstehenden Gerichtes Gottes dazu, stille zu werden und auf Gott zu hören, und das heißt, seine Gebote zu erfüllen, Kranke zu pflegen, sich um das »Haus« (die Gemeinschaft) zu kümmern und sich der Bedürfnisse der Brüder anzunehmen. Das alles ist verschlüsselt in eine lange Botschaft nach Art einer Katechese, in die ein Unmenge von Bibelstellen hineinverwoben ist. Dort taucht gegen Ende des Briefes wieder unser Zitat aus Prov 6,3 auf:

> <Mein> Sohn, treibe nicht am Ziel vorbei (Prov 3,21; Hebr 2,1), rüttle aber auch deinen Freund auf, für den du dich verbürgt hast (Prov 6,3), in dem Wissen, daß die Völker wie Reisig im Feuer sind (Jes 47,14), oder wie Spreu in der Wüste, die vom Wind <davon>getragen wird (Jer 13, 24), oder wie eine Staubwolke, die der Sturmwind hinwegnahm (Hiob 21, 18).[26]

Die alttestamentlichen Bilder, die das bevorstehende Gottesgericht über die Völker ankündigen, sind deutlich. Sie stehen in einem Argumentationszusammenhang, der den ganzen Brief durchzieht. Schon in den ersten Zeilen macht Pachom das Ziel seiner Ermahnungen klar: »... damit ihr Gott begegnen könnt am Tage der Heimsuchung.«[27] Die Anspielung auf Hebr 2,1 mit der Ermahnung, nicht am Ziel vorbeizutreiben, fügt sich ganz in diesen Zusammenhang. Aber die Bedeutung des Zitates aus Prov 6,3 war mir zu dem Zeitpunkt, als ich diesen Brief herausgab, noch nicht bewußt. Im Lichte des oben Gesagten scheint klar zu sein, daß hier in aller Knappheit das wesentliche, zentrale Anliegen Pachoms zum Ausdruck gebracht wird: am Bruder nicht in Gleichgültigkeit vorbei zu gehen, gerade angesichts des göttlichen Gerichtes.

Anstatt nur an das eigene Heil, an die eigene Rettung zu denken, gilt es, auch den Bruder aufzurütteln, der vielleicht den eschatologischen Ernst der Stunde nicht wahrnimmt.

Wiederum wird der Vers Prov 6,3c mit beiden Satzhälften angeführt. Es hätte ja genügen können, die Ermahnung zum Aufrütteln des Nächsten zu zitieren und den Rest beiseite zu lassen. Man wird wohl kaum annehmen können, Pachom habe den Satz nur der Vollständigkeit halber ganz zitiert. Denn es scheint so, als ob sich gerade in der zweiten Satzhälfte das spezifisch Pachomianische konzentriert: die Brüder sind aneinander gewiesen, füreinander verpflichtet, sie bürgen füreinander. Gerade in dieser horizontalen Verpflichtung der Brüder füreinander besteht das Besondere des pachomianischen Instituts.[28] Das erst macht die Dringlichkeit der durch drei verschiedene Bilder so nachdrücklich unterstrichenen Warnung vor dem Gericht Gottes plausibel: die Bürgschaft wird von dem richtenden Gott eingefordert werden. Unausgesprochen steht dahinter die Erinnerung an die Frage Gottes: »Wo ist dein Bruder ...?« Zu beachten ist in diesem Zusammenhang der partizipiale Anschluß: »in dem Wissen...« Angesichts des drohenden Gerichtes geht es um das Ganze, und dieses »Ganze« wird von Pachom in das Zitat aus Prov 6,3c hinein »verdichtet«.

Freilich muß auch hier wieder gefragt werden, an wen sich der Brief richtet. Der griechische Text läßt das allerdings nicht erkennen. Die lateinische Übersetzung von Hieronymus dagegen weist eine ausführliche Überschrift auf: »Epistola patris nostri Pachomii ad patrem monasterii Cornelium quod vocatur Mochanseos — Brief unseres Vaters Pachom an Cornelius, den Vater des Klosters Tmuschons.«[29] Cornelius war einer der ersten Jünger Pachoms, der gelegentlich (zusammen mit anderen) als »mächtig im Geist« und »wahrer Kämpfer Christi« bezeichnet und wegen seiner Gebetskonzentration gelobt wird.[30] Pachom hatte ihn zum Ökonom des Klosters Tmuschons ernannt. Wenn der lateinische Titel zutreffen sollte, könnte man den Brief ähnlich verstehen wie den *Liber Orsiesii*: als ein Schreiben, das sich nicht an die Brüder im allgemeinen, sondern speziell an die Oberen richtet, in diesem Falle an Cornelius. Und wiederum müßte man sagen, daß es von vornherein klar ist, daß eine gewisse Fürsorgepflicht der Oberen gegenüber den Untergebenen besteht. Sollte der Titel jedoch eine Zutat von späterer Hand und unzutreffend sein, dann wäre unsere Stelle ein schöner Beweis für die gegenseitige brüderliche Liebe, die Pachom seinen Jüngern ins Herz pflanzen wollte, ja, auf die er sie verpflichtet hielt

angesichts des Gerichtes Gottes, und das heißt doch: mit dem ganzen Ernst der göttlichen Berufung, die es an genau dieser Stelle zu verfehlen oder zu gewinnen galt. Leider ist die Frage wohl nicht mehr zu entscheiden, an wen der Brief tatsächlich gerichtet war.

Pachoms »Katechese für einen grollenden Mönch«

Umso eindeutiger ist jedoch die dritte Belegstelle, die es zu untersuchen gilt. Wir finden sie in der ersten Katechese des Pachom, die sich an einen einzelnen Bruder richtet.[31] Die Überschrift sagt, dieser Bruder sei voller Groll oder Verachtung gewesen. Auf jeden Fall spricht die Ermahnung Pachoms einen einzelnen an (»Mein Sohn«) und erinnert ihn an die grundlegenden monastischen Tugenden. Auffallend oft ist dabei von der Demut die Rede, welche gleich eingangs an dem Beispiel der vier Patriarchen Israels: Abraham, Isaak, Jakob und Josef illustriert wird. Sofort nach diesen einleitenden Sätzen fährt Pachom fort:

> Mein Sohn, eifere dem Leben der Heiligen nach und praktiziere ihre Tugenden (vgl. Hebr 6,12); wach auf und sei nicht nachlässig (Prov 6,9), feure deinen Mitbürger an, für den du dich zu Bürgen gemacht hast (Prov 6,3), wach auf, bleibe nicht unter den Toten, so wird dich Christus erleuchten (Eph 5,14), und die Gnade wird in dir erblühen (vgl. 2 Kor 4,15). Es ist nämlich die Geduld, die dir alle Gnaden offenbart; und dadurch, daß sie geduldig waren, haben die Heiligen empfangen, was ihnen verheißen war (vgl. Hebr 6,15); der Stolz der Heiligen ist <ihre> Geduld. Sei <also> geduldig, damit du zum Heer der Heiligen zugelassen wirst, überzeugt, daß du eine unverderbliche Krone empfangen wirst (1 Petr 5,4).[32]

Auch hier ist die endzeitliche Ausrichtung des Kontextes deutlich. Zweimal ertönt der eschatologische Weckruf »Wach auf!« Daß die Heiligen empfangen haben, was ihnen verheißen war, spielt ebenso deutlich auf diesen Kontext an wie die in Aussicht gestellte unverderbliche Krone. Und wieder finden wir in diesem Zusammenhang unsere Schriftstelle aus Prov 6,3. Die Stellung dieses Verses im Gesamt der Katechese deutet an, daß er an hervorgehobener Position den wesentlichen Kernpunkt alles Folgenden zusammenfassend aussagen soll. Gleich nach den einleitenden biblischen Beispielen, in dem Augenblick also, da Pachom sozusagen mit eigenen Worten zu sprechen beginnt, verwendet er dieses Zitat. Wiederum will es so scheinen, als sei mit diesen Worten alles gesagt, was Kern und Stern pachomianischen Mönchtums ist.

Da diese Katechese nicht an Obere gerichtet ist, bekommt schon der erste Satzteil besonderes Gewicht: »Feure deinen Mitbürger an« — das ist jetzt nicht die selbstverständliche Pflicht eines Vorstehers, sondern es ist die Aufgabe eines Bruders, und das bedeutet: eines jeden. Die horizontale Verbindlichkeit der Mönche untereinander ist hier ganz deutlich ausgesprochen. *Alle* sollen einander auf dem Weg zum Heil helfen. Nicht nur, daß der in dieser Katechese angesprochene Bruder keinen Groll hegen soll, nicht nur, daß er vergeben, demütig sein und Sanftmut lernen soll, vielmehr soll er sich nun positiv das Heil seines Mitbruders angelegen sein lassen.

Vielleicht war Anlaß dieser Katechese ein Vorfall, bei dem es zu Zank und Beleidigungen zwischen den Brüdern kam. Dann würde die Situation derjenigen, die Horsiesi in Lib Ors 9 anspricht, ganz genau entsprechen: es gilt, die Beleidigung zu vergeben, aber darüber hinaus sich um den Beleidiger zu sorgen um seines Heiles willen. Daß dies aber hier den Brüdern als solchen aufgetragen wird, unabhängig von ihrem Amt und Auftrag innerhalb des Klosters, läßt das spezifische Anliegen Pachoms deutlich werden.

Wiederum ist es jedoch die zweite Satzhälfte, die dieses pachomianische Spezifikum in unüberbietbarer Deutlichkeit aussagt: »... für den du dich zum Bürgen gemacht hast.« Es ist nicht nur ein Gebot der Nächstenliebe und der geistlichen Fürsorge füreinander, daß einer sich das Heil des anderen angelegen sein läßt. Nach Auffassung Pachoms haftet ein jeder vor Gott mit seinem Leben für das des anderen. So stark sieht er die Verpflichtung zur Nächstenliebe als Kern seiner Berufung. Wer sich hier verweigert, verfehlt Sinn und Auftrag der *koinonia*. Es gibt kein eigenes Seelenheil unter Absehung von dem des Bruders. Der Pachomianermönch verpflichtet sich durch seinen Eintritt in diese Gemeinschaft zur brüderlichen Heilssorge. Damit steht er vor Gott auch für seine Mitbrüder ein.

Es erweist sich damit, daß Prov 6,3 nicht zufällig von Horsiesi in Lib Ors 9 zitiert wird. Denn wenn das zuletzt Gesagte zutrifft, dann erinnert Horsiesi mit der Anführung dieses Schriftwortes die Oberen nicht nur an die Pflichten, die sie aufgrund ihres Amtes haben, sondern er weist sie auf ihre grundlegende Berufung hin, auf Sinn und Zweck der *koinonia* überhaupt. Nicht nur an ihrer Aufsichtspflicht verfehlen sie sich, wenn sie den Brüdern gegenüber gleichgültig sind, sondern an ihrer Grundberufung und damit am Sinn ihres eigenen geistlichen Lebens: der Liebe.

ANMERKUNGEN

[1] Christoph Joest, »... alle Tage den Menschen dienen.« Pachomius († 346) und seine ursprüngliche Inspiration zum koinobitischen Leben, *Erbe und Auftrag* 67 (1991) 35-50; ders., Gott und den Menschen dienen. Das Anliegen des Pachomius nach seinem Brief Nr. 3, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 103 (1992) 1-32; vgl. auch meine das Thema berührende Studie: Benedikt von Nursia und der Stellenwert gegenseitiger brüderlicher Liebe bei Pachom († 346), Horsiesi († nach 387) und Basileios d. Großen († 378), *Erbe und Auftrag* 68 (1992) 312-326.

[2] Theodor, Kat. 3: »Diese (Koinonia) hat als ihren Urheber nach den Aposteln Apa Pachom«, in: *Œuvres de S. Pachôme et de ses disciples*, éd. par L. Th. Lefort (CSCO 160), Löwen 1956 (im folgenden = Lefort, Œuvres) 41,23f; ferner ebd. 53,8; Horsiesi, »Règlements«, Lefort aaO. 95,16; 98,5f; 99,28; »Buch« des Horsiesi = *LibOrs* 12, in: *Pachomiana Latina*. Règle et Épitres de S. Pachôme, Épitre de S. Théodore et »Liber« de S. Orsiesius. Texte latin de S. Jérôme, éd. par A. Boon, Löwen 1932 (im folgenden = Boon) 116; vgl. a. die Überschriften zu Teilen der Pachomianerregel: »Die Gebote (*praecepta*) unseres Vaters Pachom, des Gottesmannes, der die Lebensform der Cönobien am Anfang (*a principio*, man könnte auch übersetzen: von Grund auf) auf Gottes Geheiß begründet hat« (Boon 13, deutsch bei: Heinrich Bacht, *Das Vermächtnis des Ursprungs*. Studien zum frühen Mönchtum II, Würzburg 1983, 82); ähnlich der Titel der *Praecepta et instituta* (Boon 53, Bacht aaO. 226).

[3] In der griechischen Vita G[1],6 in: *Sancti Pachomii vitae graecae*, edd. Hagiographi Bollandini ex recensione Francisci Halkin SI (Subsidia Hagiographica 19), Brüssel 1932 (im folgenden = Halkin) 4,17-5,15; in der bohairischen Vita Bo 10, in: *S. Pachomii vita bohairice scripta*, ed. L. Th. Lefort (CSCO 107), Löwen 1936, 5,25-7,28 = *Vies Coptes de Saint Pachôme et de ses premiers successeurs*, éd. L. Th. Lefort (Bibliothèque du Muséon 16) Löwen 1943, (im folgenden = Lefort, *Vies Coptes*) 84,14-86,23.

[4] Synkletika 16 u. 6, in: *Apophthegmata Patrum*, Migne PG 65, 425 D-428 A und 421 D-424 A, deutsch in: *Weisung der Väter*. Apophthegmata Patrum, auch Gerontikon oder Alphabeticum genannt, hg. v. Bonifaz Miller (Sophia 6), Trier 1980[2], Apo. 907 u. 897.

[5] Das zeigt auch Fidelis Ruppert, *Das pachomianische Mönchtum und die Anfänge klösterlichen Gehorsams* (Münsterschwarzacher Studien 20), Münsterschwarzach 1971 (im folgenden = Ruppert, *Mönchtum*) 85-87.

[6] Fairy v. Lilienfeld meint daher: »Charakteristisch ... für das gesamte Anachoretentum ist ein letztlich individualistisches Verständnis des mönchischen ἀγών«, Basilius der Große und die Mönchsväter der Wüste. In: dies., *Spiritualität des frühen Wüstenmönchtums*. Gesammelte Aufsätze 1962 bis 1971, hg. v. Ruth Albrecht u. Franziska Müller (Oikonomia, Quellen und Studien zur orthodoxen Theologie 18) Erlangen 1983 (im folgenden = v. Lilienfeld, *Spiritualität*) 66.

[7] Vgl. Fairy von Lilienfeld, Anthropos Pneumatikos — Pater Pneumatophoros. Neues Testament und Apophthegmata Patrum. In: v. Lilienfeld, *Spiritualität* (s. Anm. 6) 1-13.

[8] Klaus Schatz, *Geschichte des Ordenslebens*. Vorlesungen vom WS 85/86. Unveröffentlichtes Skript, 27. Ebd. findet sich auch die Verwendung des Begriffs *Ordnungsgehorsam* in dem nachstehend beschriebenen Sinne.

[9] Vgl. Heinrich Bacht, Vom gemeinsamen Leben. Die Bedeutung des pachomianischen Mönchsideals für die Geschichte des christlichen Mönchtums, *Liturgie und Mönchtum* 11 (1952) 91-110, hier: 104f.

[10] Dieser Meinung ist auch Heinrich Bacht, Pakhôme — der Große »Adler«, *Geist und Leben* 22 (1949) 367-382, hier: 374: »Gerade weil der Gehorsam das Fundament der 'vita communis' sein sollte ...« Ebenso sieht es Karl Suso Frank, Gehorsam und Freiheit im frühen Mönchtum, *Römische Quartalschrift* 64 (1969) 234-245, hier: 237ff. »Der Primat des Gehorsams im Koinobion führt Pachomius dazu, seine Mönche nie ohne Leitung und Führung zu lassen« (ebd. 238). Daß Pachom selbst die Akzente anders setzen wollte, zeigen die folgenden Ausführungen.

[11] Vgl. den Bericht von Palladios, *Historia Lausiaca* 18, über Makarios von Alexandrien, der incognito in Pachoms Kloster in Tabennesi eintrat und durch seine asketischen Höchstleistungen die Brüder gegen sich aufbrachte: *The Lausiac History of Palladius*. The Greek Text Edited with Introduction and Notes by D. Cuthbert Butler (TaS VI,2), Cambridge 1904, 52f. Palladios gibt der Geschichte allerdings eine andere »Moral«, als sie für Pachom in Wirklichkeit gehabt haben dürfte, s. H. Bacht, Antonius und Pachomius. Von der Anachorese zum Cönobitentum, in: B. Steidle (Hg.), *Antonius Magnus Eremita* (StAns 38), Rom 1956, 66-107, hier: 88 Anm. 113.

[12] So schon Pachom selbst, s. Bo 105 (CSCO 107, 90,27ff) = Lefort, *Vies Coptes* (s. Anm. 3) 178,18ff; Basileios d. Große, Kürzere Regeln 128 u. 129 (*Regulae brevius tractatae*, Migne PG 31, 1168 C-1169 A; deutsch bei Karl Suso Frank, *Basilius von Cäsarea*. Die Mönchsregeln, St. Ottilien 1981, 266f [im folgenden = Frank, *Basilius*]); Benedikt v. Nursia schreibt in seinem Kapitel über die Fastenzeit: »Was aber der einzelne als Opfer bringen will, unterbreite er seinem Abt ... denn was ohne Erlaubnis des geistlichen Vaters geschieht, wird einem als Anmaßung und eitle Ehrsucht gelten und nicht belohnt« (RB 49,8-9; vgl. a. RB 43,18-19).

[13] S^3: Lefort, *Vies Coptes* (s. Anm. 3) 65,13-20; außerdem S^1: ebd. 3,33-4,5.

[14] S^1: Lefort aaO. 4,10-18.25-36.

[15] S^3: Lefort aaO. 67,16-29. Die Auslassung steht für einen nur lückenhaft erhaltenen Satz, dessen Sinn nicht mehr rekonstruierbar ist.

[16] Ebd. 65,26-34.

[17] In demselben Sinn deutet Ruppert, *Mönchtum* (s. Anm. 5) 46-48 diesem Bericht.

[18] Zu diesem für das Mönchtum aller Zeiten wichtigen Thema vgl. Heinrich Bacht, Heimweh nach der Urkirche. Zur Wesensdeutung des frühen Mönchtums, in: ders., *Weltnähe oder Weltdistanz*? Frankfurt/M. 1962, 114-140.

[19] Dieser Begriff scheint von Pachom selbst auf seine Gemeinschaft angewendet worden zu sein. In den *Praecepta* kommt er nur Pr 136 vor (Boon 49,1); vgl. ferner die Hinweise in Anm. 2, dazu die Ansprache Theodors, in der er die Brüder an das Leben ihres Vaters »Apa Pachom« erinnert, welcher »die heilige *koinonia* gründete« (Bo 194 [CSCO 107, 119,1-17]). Adalbert de Vogüé urteilt daher: »The word *Koinonia* has probably never carried so vibrant a meaning as it did in this community surrounding, and surviving, 'Our holy Father, Apa Pachomius'« (Foreword, in: *Pachomian Koinonia I*, The Life of Saint Pachomius and His Disciples, translated, with an introduction, by Armand Veilleux, Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1980, viii). Zum Ganzen s. Heinrich Bacht, Antonius und Pachomius (s. Anm. 11); ders., Art. »Koinônia IV, Dans le monachisme«, *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* 8 (1974) 1754-1758; Terence G. Kardong, The monastic practices of Pachomius and the Pachomians, *Studia Monastica* 32 (1990) 59-78, hier: 71-78; sehr ausführlich A. Veilleux, *La Liturgie dans le cénobitisme Pachomien au quatrième siècle* (StAns 57), Rom 1968, 167-379.

[20] So sieht es auch Ruppert, *Mönchtum* (s. Anm. 5) 91-103.

[21] Vgl. dazu Basilius Steidle, Der »Obern-Spiegel« im »Testament« des Abtes Horsiesi († nach 387), *Erbe und Auftrag* 43 (1967) 22-38.

[22] Boon 114,5-8, deutsch bei H. Bacht, *Das Vermächtnis des Ursprungs*. Studien zum frühen Mönchtum I, Würzburg 1984² (im folgenden = Bacht, *Vermächtnis I*) 77.

[23] Boon 114,17-22; Bacht, *Vermächtnis I*, 79.

[24] *Regulae fusius tractatae*, Migne PG 31, 984 C-985 C (LR 25), das angeführte Zitat aus LR 29 ebd. 992 C, außerdem LR 43,2 ebd. 1028 C-1029 B; deutsch in: Frank, *Basilius* (s. Anm. 12) 142f (LR 25), 148 (Zitat LR 29) u. 176f (LR 43,2).

[25] Vgl. weiter RB 2,7.30.37-40; 64,7.

[26] Griechisch bei: Hans Quecke, *Die Briefe Pachoms*. Griechischer Text der Handschrift W 145 der Chester Beatty Library, Regensburg 1975, 106, 165-168; deutsch bei: Chr. Joest, *Gott und den Menschen dienen* (s. Anm. 1) 16,172-17,178.

[27] Zur eschatologischen Ausrichtung der Pachomianer-Spiritualität im allgemeinen s. Bacht, *Vermächtnis I* (s. Anm. 22) 79 Anm. 34; für den Pachom-Brief Nr. 3 im besonderen s. Chr. Joest aaO. 5-9.

[28] In einer Ansprache vergleicht Pachom die anachoretische Berufung mit der Koinobitischen; die Brüder der *koinonia* mögen sich vielleicht nicht durch außerordentliche Askese auszeichnen, aber »sie sind denen, die als Anachoreten leben, weit überlegen, denn sie wandeln in der Verpflichtung, in der der Apostel wandelte, wie geschrieben steht: 'Durch die Liebe des Heiligen Geistes dienet einander in einem Geist der Milde und aller Geduld vor unserem Herrn Jesus'« (Bo 105 [CSCO 107, 90,27-91,7; Ruppert, *Mönchtum* (s. Anm. 5), der 98 Anm. 278 dieselbe Ansprache zitiert, gibt versehentlich 138,3-25 an] = Lefort, *Vies Coptes* [s. Anm. 3] 178,18-36).

[29] Boon 79.

[30] G¹,79 und 111 (Halkin 53,10f u. 72,8-23).

[31] Catéchèse a propos d'un moine rancunier, in: Lefort, *OEuvres* (s. Anm. 2) 1-26.

[32] Lefort, *OEuvres* (s. Anm. 2) 1,27-2,8 (Übersetzung von mir).

D-6257 *Hünfelden*, Kommunität Gnadenthal

Vigiliae Christianae 47 (1993), 131-139, E. J. Brill, Leiden

SOUVENIRS CICÉRONIENS (HORTENSIUS, CONSOLATION) ET VIRGILIENS DANS L'EXPOSÉ D'AUGUSTIN SUR L'ÉTAT HUMAIN D'"IGNORANCE ET DE DIFFICULTÉ" (Aug., *lib. arb.* 3, 51-54)

PAR

JEAN DOIGNON

Les éditeurs modernes de l'*Hortensius*[1] ont extrait du *Contra Iulianum*, qu'Augustin écrivit dans l'année 422, le fragment de la "fin du dialogue"[2] que nous rappelons ici:

> *Ex quibus humanae (inquit) uitae erroribus et aerumnis fit ut interdum ueteres illi uates siue in sacris initiisque tradendis diuinae mentis interpretes, qui nos ob aliqua scelera suscepta in uita superiore poenarum luendarum causa natos esse dixerunt, aliquid dixisse uideantur uerumque sit illud quod est apud Aristotelem, simili nos adfectos esse supplicio atque eos qui quondam, cum in praedonum Etruscorum*[3] *manus incidissent, crudelitate excogitata necabantur, quorum corpora uiua cum mortuis aduersa aduersis adcommodata quam aptissime*[4] *colligabantur: sic nostros animos cum corporibus copulatos ut uiuos cum mortuis esse coniunctos.*[5]

On se tromperait, si l'on croyait que cette évocation cicéronienne du supplice tyrrhénien, empruntée à Aristote[6] pour illustrer les rapports conflictuels de l'âme et du corps, n'a été connue d'Augustin qu'au moment où il avait à combattre, chez Julien d'Eclane le Pélagien, par le témoignage de philosophes spiritualistes, la tentative de réhabiliter le plaisir, tentative qu'il regarde comme une résurgence de l'épicurisme matérialiste.[7]

G. Madec,[8] en effet, a reconnu, dès le premier livre du *De libero arbitrio*, rédigé à Rome en 387-388, une trace du fragment 112 Grilli de l'*Hortensius* dans la formule *ad aerumnas mortalis uitae*, qui évoque le triste aboutissement de l'homme déchu du bonheur où Dieu l'avait établi.[9] Il a échappé cependant au savant éditeur du *De libero arbitrio*, dans *BA* 6, qu'au livre 3 du même traité, Augustin donnait du fragment 112 un écho à la fois beaucoup plus précis et plus ample que dans la réminiscence très parcellaire du livre 1. Ce nouvel emprunt est suscité par

l'analyse de l'"état d'ignorance et de difficulté", dans lequel la "peine" payée pour le péché d'Adam a plongé l'homme.[10]

On a beaucoup discuté à propos de la portée métaphysique de cet "état",[11] mais on s'est peu interrogé sur l'origine de l'alliance des termes d'"ignorance" et de "difficulté". Il y a tout lieu de penser qu'elle remonte au couple de mots *errores et aerumnae*,[12] dont le frg 112 de l'*Hortensius* faisait le substrat de la vie humaine. En effet, c'est par ce binôme cicéronien qu'Augustin, dans *De libero arbitrio* 3, 20, 55, paraphrase le sien: *ignorantia et difficultas:*

> *Vt autem de illo primo coniugio et cum* ignorantia *et cum* difficultate *et cum mortalitate nascamur, quoniam illi cum peccauissent et in* errorem *et in* aerumnam *et in mortem praecipitati sunt* (...).

Il est aisé de montrer par quelles voies, cicéroniennes précisément, Augustin glisse de la première à la seconde alliance, en marquant les correspondances entre chacun des deux éléments qui les constituent.

En *lib. arb.* 3, 18, 52, il creuse la notion d'"ignorance" et y voit la cause d'une dégradation, celle que nous inflige l'"erreur": *ex ignorantia dehonestat error.*[13] La formule se modèle sur le pénible constat que fait Cicéron dans la *Consolation: Nescio qui nos teneat* error *aut miserabilis* ignoratio *ueri.*[14]

Symétrique de l'effet douloureux de l'*ignorantia*, apparaît, dans la suite de la phrase de *lib. arb.* 3, 18, 52, la conséquence de la "difficulté": *ex* difficultate *cruciatus adfligit.*[15] Certes, notre auteur donne pour sujet à la phrase *aerumnae*, non *difficultas.* Mais les deux mots se recouvrent dans l'usage augustinien, comme il ressort de cette tournure pléonastique de l'*Enarratio in psalmum* 48:[16] *in aerumna ceterisque difficultatibus mortalitatis* (*in psalm.* 48, s.1, 1).

L'*aerumna* ou *difficultas* est comme une "charge" (*labor*, selon une alliance cicéronienne[17]), que les *uoluptates* charnelles — comme le précise une phrase du *De uera religione*[18] —, nous "infligent" pour nous "torturer": *ex difficultate cruciatus adfligit.*[19] Dans le ton de l'*oxymoron* des *Tusculanes: desiderando cruciamur*,[20] cette image pathétique, si on joint à elle et à ses variantes la métaphore de la passion charnelle (*libido*) qui nous "déchire" (*lib. arb.* 3, 2, 5),[21] signe la dette qu'elles ont contractée vis-à-vis du fragment 112 de l'*Hortensius* sur le supplice de l'âme ligotée au corps. Mais, pour donner à cette dette toute sa dimension, il convient de considérer l'ensemble du développement, où s'insère le binôme *errores et aerumnae*, adopté tel quel par Augustin

ou modifié sous la forme: *ignorantia et difficultas*, et dans le fragment 112 de l'*Hortensius* et dans le groupe de paragraphes 51-55 du livre 3 du *De libero arbitrio*.

Dans le premier, Cicéron faisait référence à la thèse orphique, rapportée par Aristote,[22] de l'homme "né pour payer", à l'occasion des "égarements et des misères de la vie, les peines motivées par les crimes commis dans une vie antérieure", thèse qu'illustre le "supplice" à la mode tyrrhénienne de l'âme enchaînée au corps comme un être vivant à un cadavre.

Augustin, sans doute, substitue à la notion d'une vie antérieure souillée le rappel du handicap (*imbecillitas*) que nous héritons du péché d'Adam,[23] mais la manière dont il le décrit a beaucoup d'affinités avec la stylisation cicéronienne du "supplice tyrrhénien"; les mêmes thèmes y sont repris: l'homme, quand il naît, subit le châtiment du péché du premier homme: la mortalité;[24] ses conséquences sont le "supplice" de l'"ignorance et la difficulté";[25] son aboutissement est l'"esclavage de la chair".[26]

Voulant préciser la nature de ce "châtiment", l'auteur du *De libero arbitrio* s'appuie sur le verset de *Rom.* 7,18: *Velle adiacet mihi, perficere autem bonum non inuenio*, aveu paradoxal qu'il interprète[27] comme l'expression du conflit entre le libre arbitre et la "résistance" de la chair, résistance d'autant plus forte que, par la "violence de la transmission de la mort" (l'"impulsion" de la chair, dans la *successio prolis*,[28] nous engendre pour la mort[29]), elle est devenue une habitude naturelle. L'argumentation a pour toile de fond à nouveau le péché d'Adam, la condamnation héréditaire qui en découle et la perte mortelle de la nature où l'homme a été créé.[30]

Mais la manière dont se déploie ce dernier thème, en liaison avec celui de l'habitude de la volupté[31] créant une impulsivité naturelle,[32] doit beaucoup au cliché classique,[33] et singulièrement cicéronien, de l'habitude devenant une nature par une "distorsion" irrationnelle,[34] comme l'est l'*impetus libidinum*.[35] D'autre part, Augustin exprime cette "distorsion" par le mot *uiolentia*, un terme dont Cicéron, dans la *Consolatio*, si l'on en croit du moins une bonne partie des éditeurs anciens,[36] s'était servi pour qualifier la "fortune".[37] Le rapprochement n'est pas une simple coïncidence: Augustin, depuis le *De beata uita*, a réfléchi sur la "fortune" à l'aide, pour commencer, du fragment 59a Grilli de l'*Hortensius*, où la fortune est opposée à la *uoluntas*.[38] Il continue de le faire, dans la mouvance de l'Arpinate, au livre 3 du *De libero arbitrio*,

lorsqu'il représente "les hasards de la fortune" nous livrant "en aveugle" aux "coups et aux déchirements des passions"[39] — cette "contrainte" (*necessitas*) charnelle[40] —, de façon à provoquer, dans l'"aveuglement de l'ignorance",[41] notre "chute".[42] Cette image, loin d'être d'abord néo-platonicienne[43] dans la culture d'Augustin, doit avoir pour origine, elle aussi, compte tenu de son orchestration par celle du "précipice", où, sur les traces du premier couple, nous plongent *error, aerumna et mors*,[44] un fragment de la *Consolatio* décrivant l'*iter uitae* comme "parcouru de fractures" (*confragosum*[45]), dont Cicéron fait un symbole des "injustices, des misères et des épreuves" de la vie.[46]

L'empreinte du spiritualisme eschatologique caractéristique des fragments de la *Consolatio*, que Lactance principalement a livrés à des lecteurs tels qu'Augustin, et de l'*Hortensius*, qu'à son tour Augustin livrera à ses lecteurs lors de la polémique antipélagienne, s'accompagne, dans les chapitres du *De libero arbitrio* sur l'"état d'ignorance et de difficulté", d'une orchestration virgilienne constituée de réminiscences du discours d'Anchise, au livre 6 de l'*Enéide*, sur le "supplice" des âmes expiant leurs fautes d'antan. L. Alfonsi avait montré la similitude d'inspiration entre les lignes de l'*Hortensius* évoquant cette expiation et les vers d'*Enéide VI* consacré au même thème.[47] L'amalgame que fait Augustin de ces deux modèles confirme la justesse de l'analyse du savant italien.

Les souveniers de Virgile, qui parsèment la description du malheur de l'âme sous le coup de la "peine" infligée par le péché d'Adam à sa "succession", sont concentrés dans une même phrase du chapitre 57 du livre 3 du *De libero arbitrio:*

> *Quae (animae) cum introeunt in hanc uitam subeuntque gestanda* membra mortalia, *subeant etiam* necesse *est et* obliuionem *uitae prioris et* praesentis laborem; *unde illa ignorantia et difficultas consequetur, quod in primo homine* supplicium *mortalitatis fuit ad animi* expendendam *miseriam.*

Les inscrustations virgiliennes, que nous avons indiquées,[48] sont empruntées successivement à *Aen.* 6,732 (*terrenique hebetant artus* moribundaque membra); 6,737/738 (*...penitusque* necesse *est / multa diu concreta modis inolescere miris*); 6,715 (*...longa* obliuia *potant*); 6,436/437 (*...Quam uellent aethere in alto /* nunc *et pauperiem et duros perferre* labores); 6,739/740 (... *ueterumque malorum/* supplicia expendunt...)

Les liens qu'Augustin, même évêque, conserve avec ses modèles classiques de la *Consolation*, de l'*Hortensius* et de l'*Enéide* seraient de purs ornements, s'il ne s'en servait, en les fondant ensemble, afin de nourrir les développements de sa méditation sur le péché héréditaire commencée avec le livre 3 du *De libero arbitrio* et fondée, pour répliquer aux Manichéens, avant tout sur l'*Epître aux Romains.*[49] La raison en est sans doute que ces textes latins emblématiques étaient empreints d'une certaine saveur platonisante de la condition humaine grevée par la chute de l'âme.[50] Tel est le charisme qui explique l'intérêt jamais démenti porté par Augustin, depuis les emprunts scolaires des *Dialogues* de Cassiciacum jusqu'aux longues citations et discussions qui émaillent la *Cité de Dieu* et le *Contra Iulianum Pelagianum*, à ces sommets de la littérature spiritualiste de Rome. Leurs résonances dans les chapitres du *De libero arbitrio* sur l'"état d'ignorance et de difficulté", sont un jalon de cette longue familiarité.

NOTES

[1] *M. Tullii Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, rec. C. F. W. Müller, IV, 3, Lipsiae 1879, 324; M. Ruch, *L'"Hortensius" de Cicéron, Histoire et reconstitution*, Paris 1958, 155, frg 85; *M. Tulli Ciceronis Hortensius*, ed., comm. instr., A. Grilli (*Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'antichità*, 5), Milano-Varese 1962, 52, frg 112; L. Straume-Zimmermann, *Ciceros Hortensius* (*Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe* 15, *Kl. Phil. u. Lit.* 9). Bern 1976, 212, frg 99.

[2] Aug., *c. Iul.* 4, 15, 78: *Quanto ergo te (Iuliano) melius ueritatique uicinius de hominum generatione senserunt, quos Cicero in extremis partibus Hortensii dialogi uelut ipsa rerum euidentia ductus compulsusque commemorat! Nam cum multa quae uidemus et gemimus de hominum uanitate atque infelicitate dixisset: "Ex quibus humanae, inquit...".*

[3] Dans plusieurs manuscrits anciens des XIe-XIIe s. (Oxford, Bodleian Libr., *Bodley 134*, f. 132; *Bodley 145*, f. 107; *Add. C 181*, f. 121; Salisbury, Chapt. Libr. *65*, f. 77; Troyes, B. M. *528*, f. 89v; Vatican, *Vat. lat. 503*, f. 93v°, *Etruscorum* est lu *et rusticorum*. L'interpolation est manifeste; le ms. Paris, Bibl.nat. *lat. 2101*, f. 89° la signale à titre de variante.

[4] Au lieu d'*aptissime*, quelques manuscrits des XIIe s. lisent *artissime*: ce sont, outre les manuscrits oxoniens déja mentionnés, London, British Library *23944*, f. 109; Vatican, *Vat. lat. 500 pars 1*, f. 111. O. Plasberg, *De M. Tullii Ciceronis Hortensio dialogo*, Lipsiae 1892, 71/72 a fait justice de cette variante.

[5] Augustin, paraphrase un peu plus loin (*c. Iul.* 4, 16, 83) la donnée essentielle du fragment en ajoutant un qualificatif topique à *corporibus: corruptibilibus: Huius euidentia miseriae gentium philosophos nihil de peccato primi hominis siue scientes siue credentes compulit dicere, ob aliqua scelera suscepta in uita superiore poenarum luendarum causa nos esse natos et animos nostros corruptibilibus corporibus, eo supplicio quo Etrusci praedones captos adfligere consueuerant tamquam uiuos cum mortuis esse coniunctos.*

[6] En particulier au *Protreptique*, ainsi que l'a montré D. Turkowska, *L'"Hortensius" de Cicéron et le Protreptique d'Aristote = Prace Kom. Filol. Klas. P.A.N. 6*, Wroclaw 1965, 135.

[7] Cf. Aug., *c. Iul.* 4, 15, 76: *Huius (Dinomachi) dogma tibi placuit. Nam ipse coniungendam uoluptatem arbitratus est honestati, ut quemadmodum honestas, ita uoluptas per se ipsam adpetenda uideretur.*

[8] Cf. G. Madec, *Notes complémentaires 11: Souvenirs de l'"Hortensius"*, dans *Oeuvres de saint Augustin, Dialogues philosophiques III = BA 6*, Paris 1976, 556.

[9] Cf. Aug., *lib. arb.* 1, 11, 23: *Quamquam enim credamus hominem tam perfecte conditum a Deo et in beata uita constitutum, ut ad aerumnas mortalis uitae ipse inde propria uoluntate delapsus sit* (...).

[10] Cf. *ibid.* 3, 18, 52: *Nam sunt re uera omni peccanti animae duo ista poenalia, ignorantia et difficultas. Ex ignorantia dehonestat error, ex difficultate cruciatus adfligit. Sed adprobare falsa pro ueris ut erret inuitus et, resistente atque torquente dolore carnalis uinculi, non posse a libidinosis operibus temperare non est natura instituti hominis, sed poena damnati.*

[11] Une discussion serrée a opposé deux théologiens: Ch. Boyer, *Dieu pouvait-il créer l'homme dans l'état d'ignorance et de difficulté?, Gregorianum*, 10,1930,32-57 et Y. de Montcheuil, *L'hypothèse de l'état originel d'ignorance et de difficulté d'après le "De libero arbitrio" de saint Augustin, Rec SR*, 23, 1933, 197-221. Le premier soutenait (p. 44-45) que "tout le souci (d'Augustin) est d'établir que l'âme étant une créature si éminente, elle devait grandement louer Dieu, même si, sans faute précédente, elle commençait à exister dans la condition de l'ignorance et de la difficulté". Le second a répliqué (p. 199) que "cette ignorance et cette impuissance sont une punition du péché. S'ils constituaient notre apport natif, être leur victime ne pourrait nous être imputé à crime; et le fait qu'ils nous sont reprochés prouve qu'ils sont en nous un châtiment mérité par une faute". Ch. Boyer est revenu à la charge: *La concupiscence est elle impossible dans un état d'innocence?*, dans *Augustinus Magister* 2, Paris 1954, 737-744, article dont l'argumentation a été mise en question par H. de Lubac, *Note sur saint Augustin, De libero arbitrio, III, 20, 56*, ibid. 3, 279-286.

[12] Cette alliance cicéronienne faisait déjà sentir son influence dans le protreptique adressé à Romanianus dans *c.acad.* 1, 1, 1, comme nous l'avons signalé dans notre article: *Clichés cicéroniens et sénéquiens dans le "Contra Academicos" de saint Augustin: les égarements de la vie, le gouffre des passions, l'âme rendue à elle même*, dans *Hommages à Henry Bardon = Coll. Latomus* 187, Bruxelles 1985, 139-141 particulièrement.

[13] Cf. n. 10.

[14] Cic., *Consol.* frg 2 Vitelli. Ce fragment est transmis par Lact., *inst. diu.* 3, 14,8 et 3, 14, 20, comme appartenant à la *praefatio* de l'oeuvre: cf. K. Kumaniecki, *A propos de la Consolation de Cicéron, Ann. de la Fac. Lettres d'Aix*, 36, 1969, 374-375.

[15] Cf. n. 10.

[16] A situer aux alentours de 410 selon H. Rondet, *Chronologie des "Enarrationes in Psalmos" de saint Augustin, BLE* 68, 1967, 192.

[17] Cf. Aug., *lib. arb.* 3, 20, 57: *Subeant (animae) etiam necesse est (...) praesentis (uitae) laborem, unde illa ignorantia et difficultas consequetur.* Dans l'usage cicéronien, *labor* est jumelé avec *difficultas* (cf. *diu.* 1, 47, 105) et identifié à *aerumna* (cf. *fin.* 2, 35, 118).

[18] Cf. Aug., *uer. rel.* 20, 40: *Fit (corporea creatura) poenalis dilectori suo et eum implicat aerumnis et pascit fallacibus uoluptatibus.*

[19] Cf. n. 10.

[20] Cf. Cic., *Tusc.* 1, 40, 96: *Quod si expectando et* desiderando *pendemus animis*, cruciamur, *angimur (...)*. L'hyperbole *cruciari* a son écho dans cette interrogation d'Aug., *lib. arb.* 3, 19, 53: *Quid nos miseri fecimus, ut cum ignorantiae caecitate et difficultatis* cruciatibus *nasceremur*? La *difficultas* est liée au *uinculum carnale*: cf. *lib. arb.* 3, 18, 52 cité n. 10.

[21] Cf. Aug., *lib. arb.* 3, 2, 5: (...) *dumque fortuitis committunt casibus et animos et corpora sua tradunt se feriendos et dilaniandos libidinibus.* Cette dernière image a déjà été employée par Augustin dans *c.acad.* 1, 8, 23 pour évoquer le danger dont se protège le sage: (...) *cum se non permittit (sapiens) cupiditatibus laniandum*: cf. notre étude: *Du bonheur humain à la béatitude divine (Aug., c.acad. 1, 8, 23)*, dans *Mélanges J. Oroz* (sous presse). Le verbe *laniari*, appliqué à la vie morale, est le pivot, déjà chez Ambroise (*uirg.* 3, 2, 5.), d'une comparaison entre l'homme "qui ne sait pas régler ses passions" et l'aurige "disloqué" dans une course qu'il ne maîtrise pas, comparaison dont la source est très vraisemblablement un passage de Cic., *rep.* 2, 41, 68, comme l'a reconnu E. Heck, *Die Bezeugung von Ciceros Schrift "De republica", Spudasmata* 4, Hildesheim 1966, 108.

[22] Son orchestration philosophique a été étudiée dans le pénétrant article de J. Pépin, *La légende orphique du supplice tyrrhénien*, dans *L'art des confins = Mélanges offerts à M. de Gandillac*, Paris 1985, 387-406.

[23] Cf. Aug., *lib. arb.* 3, 19, 53-54: *Nulli enim homini ablatum est scire utiliter quaeri quod inutiliter ignoratur et humiliter confitendam esse imbecillitatem (...). Nam illud quod ignorans quisque non recte facit et quod recte uolens facere non potest* (cf. *Rom.* 7, 15), *ideo dicuntur peccata, quia de peccato illo liberae uoluntatis originem ducunt; illud enim praecedens meruit ista sequentia.* Cette présentation du péché implique-t-elle la notion de "péché involontaire"?: c'est la thèse de M.E. Alflatt, *Involuntary Sin in Augustine, REAug* 20, 1974, 113-134, combattue par R. J. O'Connell, "*Involuntary Sin*" *in the* De libero arbitrio, *REAug* 37, 1991, 32-33 particulierement.

[24] *Ibid.* 3, 20, 57: *Vnde illa ignorantia et difficultas consequetur, quod in primo homine supplicium mortalitatis fuit.*

[25] *Ibid.* 3, 20, 56 Augustin parle du *supplicium peccati* représenté, pour "les âmes qui naissent", par "l'ignorance et la difficulté".

[26] *Ibid.* 3, 19, 54: *Dicimus (...) istam (naturam), in qua ex illius damnati poena et mortales et ignari et carni subditi nascimur.*

[27] Le verset est cité en *lib. arb.* 3, 18, 51 et commenté *ibid.* 3, 18, 52 en ces termes: *Nec mirandum est quod uel ignorando non habet arbitrium liberum uoluntatis ad eligendum quid recte faciat uel, resistente carnali consuetudine, quae uiolentia mortalis successionis quodam modo naturaliter inoleuit, uideat quid recte faciendum sit et uelit nec possit implere.* L'habitude morbide du plaisir est un des *topoi* de la polémique antimanichéenne d'Augustin: cf. *c. Fort.* 22.

[28] Une des premières occurrences de la formule se trouve dans *mor. Manich.* 17, 61.

[29] Cf. Aug., *in Gal.* 48: (...) *impetu consuetudinis naturalis, qua mortaliter nati sumus.*

[30] Cf. Aug., *lib. arb.* 3, 18, 52 (texte cité n. 10) avec le commentaire de P. F. Beatrice, *Tradux peccati. Alle fonti della dottrina agostiniana del peccato originale, Studia patrist. Mediolan.* 8, Milano 1978, 69-71.

[31] Cf. Aug., *c. Fort.* 22 (en 392): *Cum autem ista libertate fecerimus aliquid et facti ipsius tenuerit animam perniciosa dulcedo et uoluptas, eadem ipsa sua consuetudine sic implicatur, ut postea uincere non possit, quod sibi ipsa peccando fabricata est.*

[32] Cf. n. 29.

[33] Cliché étudié, dans toute son extension, par J. H. Waszink, *Die Vorstellungen von der Ausdehnung der Natur in der griechisch-römischen Antike und im frühen Christentum*, dans *Pietas. Festschrift für B. Kötting* = *JbAC, Erg.-Bd* 8, Münster 1980, 30-38.

[34] Cf. Cic., *Hort.* frg 66 Grilli: *ut ea sibi ratio uera restituat quae consuetudo uitiosa detraxerat.* Ce texte a servi à Augustin de tremplin à une *synkrisis* entre *ratio* et *usus* dans *lib. arb.* 3, 5, 17: cf. J. Doignon, *La raison et l'usage: Une "synkrisis" d'inspiration cicéronienne dans le De libero arbitrio de saint Augustin, WS* 96, 1983, 181-188.

[35] La formule se trouve dans Cic., *fin.* 1, 14, 46. Sur l'aspect irrationnel de l'*impetus libidinum* cf. Cic. *inu.* 2, 54, 164, où Cicéron évoque la *rationis in libidinem atque in alios non rectos impetus animi firma et moderata dominatio. Impetus* est le terme qu'Augustin, *in Gal.* 48 appliquera à la *consuetudo* de la chair: cf. n. 29.

[36] Ainsi C. Sigonius, *Fragmenta Ciceronis*, Venetiis 1559, 26-27; *M. Tullii Ciceronis opera omnia* (...), ed. F. A. Nobbe, Lipsiae 1827, 1373; *M. Tullii Ciceronis opera quae supersunt omnia*, rec. I. C. Orellius, 4/2, Turici 1828, 489; *M. Tullii Ciceronis opera quae supersunt omnia* ex recensione I. C. Orellii (...) continuauerunt I. G. Baiter-C. Halm, 4/2, Turici 1861, 990; *M. Tullii Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, rec. R. Klotz, 4/2, Lipsiae 1871, 291.

[37] Cf. Lact., *inst.* 3, 19, 14: *Cicero in Consolatione "non nasci" inquit "longe optimum nec in hos scopulos incidere uitae, proximum autem, si natus sis, quam primum tamquam ex incendio effugere* uiolentiam *fortunae".* Tel est le libellé du ms. *H* (Vatican, *Palat. lat.* 161 IX s.), injustement disqualifié par l'éditeur des *Diuinae institutiones*, S. Brandt dans *CSEL* 19, 242-243); de là, le texte ci-dessus edité par ses soins sans *uiolentiam* (*CSEL* 19, 242-243) et harmonisé avec celui de beaucoup d'éditeurs de la *Consolatio*, en particulier C. F. W. Müller et C. Vitelli. La question est loin d'être tranchée: nous y reviendrons ailleurs.

[38] Cf. Aug., *beat. uit.* 2, 10: *Nam in Hortensio, quem de laude ac defensione philosophiae librum fecit, (...) ait: "Plus enim mali prauitas uoluntatis adfert quam fortuna cuiquam boni".*

[39] Cf. *lib. arb.* 3, 2, 5 (texte cité n. 21) en ajoutant ce qui suit: (...) *diuina iudicia negantes, humana fallentes, eos a quibus accusantur fortunae patrocinio propulsare se putant, quam tamen caecam effingere ac pingere consuerunt, ut aut meliores ea sint, a qua se regi arbitrantur, aut se quoque cum eadem caecitate et sentire ista fateantur et dicere.*

[40] Cf. *ibid.* 3, 19, 53: *Quid nos miseri fecimus, ut (...), ubi nobis inciperent aperiri praecepta iustitiae, uellemus ea facere et, retinente carnalis concupiscentiae nescio qua* necessitate, *non ualeremus?* (cf. *Rom.* 7, 18)

[41] Cf. *ibid.* 3, 19, 53. (texte cité n. 20): *caecitas ignorantiae*; 3, 20, 56: *uirtutes per quas et a difficultate cruciante et ab* ignorantia caecante *liberetur.*

[42] Cf. *ibid.* 3, 20, 56: *Quid enim indignum, si etiam sic uoluit creator ostendere usque adeo excellere creaturis corporeis animae dignitatem, ut ab eo gradu possit esse ortus alterius, ad quam alterius est perductus* occasus?

[43] C'est la thèse de R. J. O'Connell, *Saint Augustine's Early Theory of Man (A.D. 386-391)*, Cambridge Mass. 1968, 148-155. Plus décisifs sont les points de contact entre des passages du livre 3 des *Ennéades* de Plotin et des textes du livre 3 du *De libero arbitrio* qu'a relevés F. De Capitani, *Il "De Libero Arbitrio" di S. Agostino, Studio introduttivo, testo, traduzione e commento, Vita e Pensiero* 36, Milano 1987, 205-207, sans mentionner d'ailleurs la formule finale de *lib. arb.* 3, 20, 56 citée n. 42.

[44] Cf. d'une part, *lib. arb.* 3, 20, 55: *Illi (Adam et Eua) cum peccauissent et in errorem et in aerumnam et in mortem praecipitati sunt*; d'autre part, *ibid.* 3, 22. 64; *Quem profectum (...), si propria uoluntate neglexerit (anima) iuste in grauiorem, quae iam poenalis est, ignorantiam difficultatemque praecipitatur.*

[45] *Confragosum* fait alliance avec *praecipitium* dans des périphrases sur la "voie" de la vie chez Lact., *inst.* 6, 7, 6 et 6, 17, 13.

[46] Cic. *Consol. ap. Lact. Plac. ad Stat. Theb.* 1, 306-307: = frg 10 Vitelli: *Mortis somnos "dulces" dixit; nam in uita dulces non sunt; ut Cicero: "Hoc iter uitae tam confragosum putamus, tam plenum iniuriarum ac miseriarum atque laborum"* Contrairement à l'opinion que j'émettais dans mon article: *Lactance intermédiaire entre Ambroise de Milan et la "Consolation" de Cicéron?, REL* 51, 1973, 218, n. 3, je reconnais aujourd'hui dans ces lignes un fragment de la *Consolation*, qui, par l'intermédiaire d'Ambroise (cf. L. Alfonsi, *Ambrogio ciceroniano, VChr* 20, 1966, 83-85), aurait atteint Augustin.

[47] Cf. L. Alfonsi, *Sulla "Consolatio" di Cicerone, Convivium*, n.s. 33, 1965, 621 particulièrement.

[48] Aucune allusion n'y est faite dans la somme de P. Courcelle, *Lecteurs païens et lecteurs chrétiens de l'Enéide, 1. Les témoignages littéraires, Institut de France, Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, n.s. 4, Paris 1984, 487-492.

[49] Cf. M. G. Mara, *L'influsso di Paolo in Agostino*, dans *Le Epistole paoline nei Manichei, i Donatisti e il primo Agostino, Sussidi patristici* 5, Roma 1989, 139-154.

[50] Augustin le reconnaîtra dans les débats qu'il aura avec les *Platonici* au livre 21 du *De ciuitate Dei*, comme le montrent les pages de P. Courcelle citées n. 48.

F. 75015 *Paris*, 120, Avenue Félix Faure

Vigiliae Christianae 47 (1993), 140-157, E. J. Brill, Leiden

ANICIAN WOMEN, THE CENTO OF PROBA, AND ARISTOCRATIC CONVERSION IN THE FOURTH CENTURY

BY

HAGITH SIVAN

The contribution of aristocratic women to the Christianisation of the Roman senatorial aristocracy has become virtually canonised in modern scholarship.[1] How and when the noble women of Rome achieved the conversion of their male relatives has never been traced with precision. Scholarly attention has centered, for the most part, on the ascetic associates of Jerome, whose activities in the 380s and the 390s have been illustrated by equally devout men.[2] Recent research, however, on the religious affiliation of high office holders in the first half of the fourth century points to a significant number of Christians already under Constantine and Constantius II and raises questions about the scope and nature of female contribution to the process of conversion.[3] How did women, before the advent of asceticism, express their Christian piety? How did they disseminate their faith, and how influential were they in the religious politics of the day? To explore these issues the present study centers on the women of one noble clan, the Anicii of Rome, about whom we are exceptionally well informed. At the core of this investigation is an unusual document traditionally associated with an Anician woman, the so-called Cento of Proba.[4]

Any evaluation of the function of Proba's cento as an instrument of Christianisation has to consider its author and date. In view of doubts recently cast on the traditional identification of the centonist and her dates, the first part of this study explores these issues.[5] Then, the conversion of the Anicii and their collaterals will be considered with particular attention to the role of the female members of the clan.

I. Who wrote the cento of Proba?

As it stands, Proba's cento contains nearly seven hundred lines preceded by fifteen lines of dedication. The narrative of the cento is

based, for the most part, on the books of Genesis and Matthew.[6] Proba chose to balance the narrative of the first six chapters of Genesis (from the creation to the flood) with a selection of episodes from the whole of Matthew, starting with Christ's childhood and baptism and ending with the crucifixion, resurrection and ascension. Her declared intention was to sing the praises of Christ in Virgilian verses.[7] This she achieves by resorting to the medium of the cento, a composite structure built exclusively of verses borrowed from a well-known poet, in this case from Virgil.[8] By incorporating Virgil into a poem of epic contents and dimension Proba applies the classically proportioned phrases of the Aeneid, the Georgics and the Eclogues to the prose narrative of the Bible which she probable knew in its Vetus Testamentum Latin translation. Clearly the limitations imposed on a poet working within this sort of literary tradition were considerable, but on the other hand the availability of ready-made phrases written in the best style must have eased this contraint.

Since the seventh century Isidore of Seville, the *Probae Cento* has been transmitted in the name of Faltonia Betitia Proba, wife of Adelphius, usually identified as the Praefectus Urbis Romae in 351.[9] Her name points to a connection with the Petronii and the Anicii.[10] Her Cento has been dated to c.350 or, more broadly, to some time between the mid 350s and 370, the presumed date of her death.[11]

A brief examination of the mediaeval evidence concerning the identity of the cento's authoress reveals an interesting progression. Starting with Isidore, some two centuries after the cento, Proba is wedded to Adelphius, described by Isidore as *proconsul*, an office which does not feature in his known *cursus*. The point was probably made to enhance Proba's noble connections rather than her husband's political standing. Three centuries later, a subscription to a lost tenth century manuscript endows the couple with two sons, Olybrius and Alypius.[12] Confusion, however, had set in fairly early. One manuscript (Vat. Reg. lat. 1666) gives her tria nomina (Flatonie Vetitie Probe) and weds her to Alypius, presumably confusing the fater with a son.[13] Another entry (Vat. Pal. lat. 1753) calls her *Aniciorum matrem*, recalling well-known epitaphs of another Anician woman, Anicia Faltonia Proba.[14] In yet another mediaeval manuscript a catalogue entry ascribes the cento to Valeria Proba Anicia.[15]

The Cento itself merely gives the name Proba (vs. 12). Whence, then, did Isidore derive his information? Proba is conspicuously absent from

Jerome's contemporary compilation of famous literary figures, although he was probably familiar with her work. His testimony, in fact, raises further questions concerning the identity of the centonist. In a letter (*Ep.* 53) to Paulinus of Nola which dates to the early 390s Jerome exhorts his new correspondent to read the Scriptures with the aid of an expert guide.[16] By way of emphasising his own suitability for the task Jerome denigrates other interpreters who might have claimed to provide equally authoritative guidance. Among these there is a *garrula anus* or talkative old woman who is not mentioned by name.[17] He further cites three Virgilian verses to demonstrate the uses and abuses of the cento, all of which were indeed employed by Proba in her biblical verse paraphrase.[18]

If the 'talkative old woman' is a real person, to be identified with the unnamed user of Virgil, and if indeed both refer to our centonist, it is somewhat surprising that Jerome aimed his arrows at a dead author and at a work written at least twenty years before, if not more. The passage in question (53.7) starts with a general denunciation of the practice of teaching before learning; then lashes those who preach the Gospel to women and, even worse, learn from women how to teach men; and becomes particularly abrasive with those who use, or rather abuse, their familiarity with secular writings, and particularly with Virgil, to misinterpret the Scriptures. Jerome's points were clearly intended to make an immediate impression on his reader, and to foster the notion that the chatty old woman was ready then and there to mislead innocent beginners like Paulinus. Such a manner of writing implies that the cento enjoyed wide circulation in the 390s, but suggests a certain confusion regarding the identity of its author and her dates. When Jerome issued his warning there were at least two Probae with a claim to Christian fame and piety, the authoress (Faltonia Betitia Proba), and her relative Anicia Faltonia Proba (see below). Proba's exclusion from Jerome's *de viris inlustribus* is another puzzling aspect of the nature of his familiarity with the cento's author. She could have hardly been excluded on the basis of her gender since Isidore includes her in a similar compilation which bears an identical title. Was she deliberately excluded because he disagreed about her approach to the Scriptures or because he was uncertain about the authorship of the cento? Or both?[19] Be that as it may, Jerome could not have been Isidore's source for his entry, particularly since the latter is complimentary and rather appreciative of Proba's literary efforts.

Unless the transmission of the cento was accompanied by some sort of identifying inscription, and we have no evidence of this, we must assume that Isidore had access to an unidentified source of information, like an Anician genealogy.[20] An extended stemma of the Anicii would have provided him with at least four Probae, the earliest of whom was Adelphius' wife.[21] The same source would have informed the tenth century scribe that the couple sired two sons. In the cento itself the poetess refers to a husband (693: *dulcis coniunx*) and to their descendants (694: *nepotes*), but no names are given. Adelphius did commemorate his wife as *incomparabilis uxor*, a touching tribute to a woman he forbore to name.[22] But these words carry no hint of the talent and achievement of a woman who made such a contribution to the formation of the genre of biblical paraphrases. We are left, then, with a gap of two centuries in which any association could have been manufactured but no longer substantiated.

Recently the traditional authorship of the cento has been challenged and transferred from Faltonia Betitia Proba to another famous Anicisan, Anicia Faltonia Proba, wife of an influential and affluent politician, Sextus Petronius Probus. Its date of composition has been likewise brought forward to the late 380s.[23] This identification has been made on the basis of a few verbal similarities between the cento and a poem known as the *carmen contra paganos*. Unfortunately, the date of the latter has been hotly contested and can hardly serve as a sure guide to either the date of our poem or its authorship.[24]

According to Ausonius, Proba's contemporary, who prefaced an epithalamium with a prose letter on the genre, a cento is essentially a continuous poem made of loose parts whose components are arbitrarily connected to make them appear naturally related.[25] The quotations used had to be as precise as the original and reemployed to fit with the caesuras in a line. The technique clearly called for an excellent memory, although centonists probably from time to time consulted the text as well. The patchwork nature of the cento seems to lend itself, to some extent, to the introduction of revisions and additions, either by the poet or by a skillful editor, without impairing the apparent unity of the whole.

A hypothesis that proposes to regard the cento of Proba as a work which underwent later editorial revisions and additions, also questions a basic and prevailing assumption regarding the organic unity of each literary work.[26] Recently, however, research into works which appeared

to have been composed in one sitting and by one author, has unearthed layers of composition and even traces of a late addition by another hand. A good case in point is Prudentius' *Contra Symmachum*, a work in two books composed, as the supporters of the unitarian theory believe, in direct continuity in 402/3.[27] But, according to one recent analysis, the first book of the *CS* represents a conflation of two original drafts, each written at a different date with a different purpose.[28] This hypothesis sees the first book as a patchwork composed of pre-existing material to which a prologue and an ending were added on the occasion of the publication of the two books. Another recent contribution to the debate suggests that an important line (I.551) is a late addition, perhaps by Prudentius himself but more probably by a later hand.[29] In this light, the poem against Symmachus emerges as a tissue of distinctly separate layers put together and revised at a later date by the poet himself, with at least one subsequent addition by an editor or interpolator. Ausonius, a much imitated model of Prudentius, refers several times to the introduction of revisions and to editorial procedures regarding the formal publication and diffusion of his poems.[30]

Proba's cento contains very few references which can be used to provide a conclusive proof about editorial process or additions. She does not refer in concrete terms to a single datable historical event, and her autobiographical comments need to be carefully evaluated for hints about the poem's process of composition. All such references appear in the various proemia of the cento (imperial dedication 1-15; first proemium 1-28; second proemium 29-55; preface to the NT 333-45), in one digression (415-28), and in its concluding appeal (689-94).

Several manuscripts of the cento include a non-Virgilian verse dedication (1-15) which has been commonly ascribed to a later hand. It starts with an address to an unnamed emperor glorified as leader of the Romans, the other glory of the bright sun, just ruler of the east, hope of the universe and, significantly, as ornament to his brother (*Romulidum ductor, clari lux altera solis,/eoa qui regna regis moderamine iusto,/spes orbis fratrisque decus*, 1-3). Since the dedicator predicts the birth of a *minor Arcadius* (13-4), it has been surmised that the dedicatee is the emperor Arcadius (395-423), and that the cento's dedication must have been written between his accession in 395, and the birth of his son, Theodosius II in 401. The imperial dedication does not disclose the name of the cento's composer or even hint at her identity. It states that the copy had been ordered by the emperor himself (*scriben-*

dum famulo quem iusseras, 5), a somewhat unlikely gesture for the inert young emperor, who would have been nonetheless rather flattered to be so addressed. Yet, how likely is it that a mere scribe composed this imperial dedication? To the best of my knowledge, there are no other poems that have come down to us with a dedication composed by another person, least of all by an anonymous scribe.[31] Nor is the image of a humble scribe exhorting an emperor to read and cherish a poem which he copied a plausible one.[32]

A careful perusal of the imperial dedication suggests a precise date and context for the presentation of the cento to Arcadius. The cento had originated in the west, and more specifically within a Roman context. The imperial dedication makes sense against a similar background, for a dedication composed in the eastern court was hardly likely to designate Arcadius as 'ruler of the east' or 'the other light' or as 'an ornament to his brother'. In fact, the whole tone of the dedication is western and possibly Anician. The words appear to reflect a period when a peaceful co-existence of the two parts of the empire would call for a dedication putting an unusual emphasis on both emperors. Such a period lasted only throughout the first months of 395, before the elimination of Rufinus (PPO) and the rise of Eutropius to power in the eastern court. At this particular moment, it was also highly appropriate to speak of a putative heir to the throne, a 'small Arcadius', for the emperor had just got married.

For the Anicii, the year 395 represented the culmination of their accumulated power and prestige. For the ninth time within less than a century, the consular fasti of the empire bore an Anician name, but this time both consuls were Anicians, and brothers. In a century in which the honour of a consulship was almost exclusively reserved for the emperors, their relatives, and their generals, this was, to say the least, a spectacular recognition of the status of the Anicii of Rome. The family also boasted its intellectual and literary aspirations. Just a few years before the cento was dedicated to Arcadius, Proba's nephew, Petronius Probus, presented the emperor Theodosius with a volume of poetic works composed by three generations of Petronian males.[33] The literary tastes and interests of his son, Olybrius, were acknowledged by Claudian, Symmachus, and the author of a volume on rhetoric.[34] A gesture like the dedication of an Anician cento to an emperor ruling over a court where Petronius Probus spent a few years, appears to be in character and could have served as a useful reminder of the cordial

relations between the most eminent Christian family of Rome and the house of Theodosius.[35]

One other aspect of the Anician dedication deserves some attention. Lines 5 to 12, the bulk of the imperial dedication, contain a list of the cento's contents. Whoever wrote them apparently desired to emphasise the NT (New Testament) section, for the dedication sums up the contents of the OT (Old Testament) part with barely two lines (*hic tibi mundi/principium formamque poli hominemque creatum/expediet limo*, 5-7) while devoting nearly six to the NT (7-12). The impression thus created is of a poem heavily focused on the events of the NT, with only a passing look at the stories of the Creation.[36] Yet, the cento is virtually equally divided between a narrative of OT and NT events, each occupying nearly 300 lines. Although the dedication's emphasis on the NT may have been deliberate, it is not altogether unlikely that the cento dedicated to Arcadius may have contained a shorter version of the OT section. Hypothetical as this may appear, it is worth noting that there is at least one archetypal lacuna in that part (at line 233), a tenuous but possible indication of different archetypes.[37]

The first general preface to the poem itself (1-28) includes only a few Virgilian quotations. Its themes are the author's renunciation of her past literary enterprises, an appeal to God, and the aim of the present work. It then declares the author's repudiation of the muses, of secular (pagan) poetry, and of earthly poetic fame; and finally embarks on another appeal to God, announcing once more the aim of the work and its subject, and concluding with the pious hope of being able to bring the work to its conclusion. The style is elaborately allusive and referential. Three words define the main subject of the entire poem, namely *pia munera Christi* (23), which she intends to trace *ab origine* (24).

Proba's preface also refers to a specific poetic undertaking in her past (1-8) and her words imply that she had written a historical epic on a civil war.[38] Other than a vague description which recalls Lucretius, no clue is supplied to unravel the subject of this war or its date. The compiler of a subscription in a (lost) tenth century ms. of the cento states that this was the war between Constantine (emended to Constantius) and Magnentius, which ended with the former's victory at Mursa in 353; another reading proposes Maxentius and Constantine.[39]

If the centonist was indeed Adelphius' wife, her reason and choice of subject for a war epic raise some questions. Adelphius had gained his highest promotion (Praefectus Urbis Romae) under Magnentius in 351.

He was replaced by L. Aradius Valerius Proculus Populonius, and accused of *maiestas*.[40] The story of the charge against him is obscure. According to Ammianus, our sole source of information, Adelphius' accuser was a certain Dorus, who in 356 launched a similar charge against another eminent person, Arbetio, Magister Equitum and consul in 355. Adelphius' fate is not known and his name does not appear on the surviving administrative fasti after 351. Had Adelphius' trial taken place under Magnentius, it is not clear why the latter would have wished to prosecute a well-connected member of the Roman aristocracy, a class whose support was essential for the survival of his regime. Ammianus, in fact, does not indicate whether the charge was connected with Adelphius' vacating the position of the Urban Perfect, or whether it took place much later. Taking into account the notoriously suspicious nature of Constantius II, a charge of this sort fits rather well into the pattern of treason charges under that monarch.[41] Proba's own words do not hint at a sympathy for either side. Nor are there contemporary parallels to support the use of epic literature to gain imperial pardon.[42] Her subject may have been mythological rather than historical.[43] Or, as at least one mediaeval scribe seems to have thought, her poem may have commemorated the victory of Constantius' father over Maxentius in 312, an event that led to the legalisation of Christianity. As soon as the identity of the poetess was settled on the early Proba, Maxentius was confused or changed to Magnentius. It made sense, after all, to choose the most contemporary civil war among the many which beset the fourth century.

Proba's rejection of secular poetry in the first preface has been regarded as a rejection of paganism in favour of Christianity.[44] She declares there her intention to devote all her might to the service of God and to abandon any type of literary undertaking not directly relevant to this purpose. Such a renunciation need not entail a religious conversion. In his confessional preface, Prudentius announced his newly resolved dedication to God at the age of 57.[45] This announcement hardly amounts to conversion from one creed to another but rather to a decision to adopt a more rigorous Christian way of life. For Prudentius, indeed, this resolution entailed the rejection of conventional Christianity in favour of a life of full religious commitment.

Following the first proemium the poet introduces another preface (29-54), wholly composed of Virgilian verses and generally perceived as a specific prologue to the section on the OT. It opens with an invocation

to God, based on Venus' appeal to Jupiter (A. 10.18f.), here made to conform to a Christian mould. Next, the poetess acknowledges the sins of her youth and refers to previous accounts of creation, now to be superseded by her own Christian account. Both the first and the second prefaces present several striking parallels: Lines 1-8, where she confesses (*confiteor*, 8) her literary past, find a resounding echo in lines 47-53 where she confesses (*fatebor*, 47) her past sins. Lines 9-12 invoke the all powerful God who reappears in lines 29-34, this time accompanied by his son. Her renunciation of her literary past (12-19) is again echoed in lines 47-53, while her resolution to devote herself to Christian poetry is repeated in lines 45-6. The only noticeable differences between two prefaces are an appeal to Christ in the second invocation (31-4), followed by a reference to past accounts of the creation (35-7).

Double prefaces of this sort, with significant overlapping, are a rare phenomenon in late Roman literature. Ausonius favoured the employment of two, and sometimes even three prefaces, but usually cast one in prose and the other in verse, or wrote one as a personal dedication and the other as a general one to his putative readership.[46] Proba's use of two largely identical prefaces, one in hexameters, the other in specifically Virgilian hexameters, seems unique. Perhaps the recasting of the non-Virgilian preface in Virgilian verses was meant to provide a smooth transition between the preliminaries and the text of the cento. The idea may have been the poetess', but a later editorial desiring to induce both a Virgilian and a Christian flavour is not altogether unlikely.

A third preface (333-45) opens the narrative of the NT and follows a passage which serves as a conclusion to the OT part (319-32). At the core of the OT's coda is a lengthy rhetorical question hinting at events of the Exodus which Proba decided to exclude from her own account. As before, she is keen to reject subject matter which touches on wars, armies and violence, and juxtaposes her past and its lesser endeavours, with the present and its sublime undertaking.[47] Having, then, left the OT narrative just after recounting the flood, she prefaces her NT section with a paragraph that extols Mary and focuses on the poetess and her contribution to the diffusion of Christ's greatness. In a sense, either the OT coda or the NT prelude could have served the literary purpose of changing from one narrative to another, particularly since both the NT preface and the NT section start with a temporal clause (*nunc*, 333; *iamque*, 346). This double emphasis recalls the imperial dedication and

raises a question about the original framework of the work. Did the original cento omit the NT preface?

Launching into seventy lines on NT events which focus on the birth and early years of Christ, Proba inserts a personal digression on her own quest for salvation (415-428). The passage is difficult and its allusions are open to both allegorical and literal interpretations. There is a reference to baptism (420-1) which could be taken to refer to spiritual renovation, to actual baptism, or to conversion from paganism to Christianity. The last is unlikely. The first two are feasible, all the more since baptism was often administered on the death-bed of an already long-standing member of the Christian community. At the beginning of the digression the poetess expresses her gratitude to Christ who gave her hope, and proclaims her utter commitment to Him. To describe the extent of her loyalty to her faith she declares (in a lengthy unreal conditional clause, 422-5) her readiness to follow Christ wherever she might be, even were she an exile in Africa. Her choice here of an appropriate Virgilian quotation is instructive. Virgil uses the expression to describe Aeneas' determination to discharge his vows to his father wherever he may be, be it Africa or anywhere else. The places he refers to in the unreal conditional clause include, in fact, locations where he had been, and lend a concrete force to his declaration of obligation. Perhaps Proba selected this particular phrase since, in her case, it also carried two meanings, expressing both her own commitment and possibly an actual experience. Had the digression been composed in Africa, the Virgilian words would have been both fitting and poignant. Otherwise, it seems difficult to account for the insertion of a digression at this point in the narrative, unless Proba felt that her own experience lent force to the account of Christ's own baptism and promise of salvation. With her own baptism she could have felt reasonably assured of help, and may well have written these lines to recall a personal example of a timely divine intervention. Whether the digression was originally conceived as an integral part of the cento, or added at a later stage, remains an open and tantalising question.

At the end of the Cento, a *precatio* is addressed to the poet's *socii* and to her *dulcis coniunx* (689-94). Both the 'allies-in-faith' and the 'sweet spouse' are encouraged to celebrate the rites (of the Ascension). From this it has been commonly inferred that the poetess' husband was alive at the time of writing. This is likely enough, although the language (esp. *dulcis coniunx*) evokes formulae of funerary inscriptions, and in Virgil

it is the dead Creusa who addresses Aeneas (II.777) and advises him to leave Troy. The last line of the cento refers to Proba's descendants (*nepotes*) who are, presumably, Christians like herself and, as the poem also implies, like her husband.

A brief look at the preceding analysis brings to mind a poetess whose commitment to Christianity found expression in a rejection of her secular past and in a literary composition which enlisted the best of Latin poets to the service of her creed. Admittedly, none of the arguments so far offered is strong enough to dethrone Faltonia Betitia Proba from her position as the author of the cento, some time after the middle of the fourth century and before, say, AD 370. From the end of the fourth century, however, her cento circulated with an imperial dedication that may have been added by an editorial hand connected with Anician circles at Rome. Within the poem itself there are hints of later additions, such as a second (Virgilian) general preface and a specific NT preface in the middle. A digression within the section on the NT hints at an African episode, if the reference is taken to be actual rather than allegorical. It could have also been a late addition which breaks the narrative after the baptism of Christ and an address to Him by God. The final lines of the cento forecast the preservation and continuity of the Christian creed within the family. All these considerations are, admittedly, too undecisive to undermine the identification of the authoress as Faltonia Betitia Proba, wife of Adelphius, but they seem to cast doubt on the unity of the poem and to suggest several stages of composition with a few late additions. A juxtaposition of the poem with the few pieces of external evidence, from Jerome through Isidore to mediaeval scribes, further suggests a certain confusion regarding the precise date and identity of the centonist who identified herself as Proba. The confusion may have arisen from the presence of several Anician Probae and particularly, from the dominant place occupied by Anicia Faltonia Proba, wife of Sextus Petronius Probus, in noble Christian activities. What role, then, did Anician women and a work like the cento play in the adoption of Christianity by the Anicii?

II. The Christianisation of the Petronii/Anicii

In the early years of the fourth century a certain Probus was the recipient of several books of letters from the African rhetor, theologian and poet, Lactantius.[48] The precise date is unclear but it has been suggested

that this Probus is Petronius Probianus, consul in 322, head of the Petronii, whose family intermarried with the Anicii throughout the fourth century.[49] Both Probianus and Lactantius had an interest in poetry. The consul apparently beguiled his spare time in composing poems which his grandson presented years later to the emperor Theodosius. Probianus also had extensive properties and contacts in Africa, Lactantius' homeland, and throughout the fourth century the Petronii and the Anicii monopolised senatorial offices there.[50] Probianus' political activities highlight the thought process behind the formation of political alliances between the Roman senatorial aristocracy and the Christian emperors. As soon as Constantine emerged victorious from his campaign against Maxentius in 312, the Petronii promptly offered their services to the victor and were handsomely rewarded. Probianus' father, Petronius Anianus was consul in 314 and Probianus became consul in 322.[51] Their success may have been due not only to a timely transfer of allegiance but also to their adoption of the imperial creed.[52]

The same considerations have been thought to explain the reappearance of the Anicii on the imperial fasti of the 320s after a conspicious absence during the 310s.[53] Although concrete proof of Anician male creeds is lacking, the careers of Amnius Anicius Iulianus and of Sextus Anicius Paulinus in the 320s may signal a carefully planned conversion as part of a deliberate effort to win imperial favour. The religious affiliation of their spouses is unknown, but even had they been Christians at this early stage, it seems evident that the selection of this creed by these male aristocrats was motivated by political rather than religious calculations.

The centonist Proba, the earliest of the fourth century recorded Probae, was born c.320, perhaps even in a Christian family: Chastagnol makes her a daughter of Petronius Probianus and Demetrias.[54] Her husband's creed is unclear but he may have been related to an Adelphia, a Christian noble woman probably married to a scion of the Aradii.[55] Proba's cento is an early expression of what has been termed "Christian aristocrate poetry".[56] She emerges as a pioneer in company with two other aristocrats, Publilius Optatianus Porphyrius and Juvencus, who both wrote in the age of Constantine. Yet, within the process of Anician Christianisation, the cento signals not the appearance and adoption of the creed but rather a demonstration of continuing commitment. In this light, it confirms rather than initiates decisions which the clan had already made regarding religious options.

Proba's pride in her illustrious name is manifest in her self-introduction at the start of her cento (12) where she also defines her literary identity (*vatis Proba*). Although such statements have an established literary tradition, Proba's model, Virgil, placed his self-presentation at the end, rather than the start, of his Georgics. (4.559-66). Ausonius, by contrast, developed the poetic presentation of one's persona into an elaborate introductory poem full of autobiographical details.[57] Proba inserts her name and vocation in an invocation to God (9f.), perhaps desiring thus to highlight the special relation between herself and her divine source of inspiration. In another context, the head of the Anicii of Rome, Petronius Probus (Proba's nephew?), proclaimed special and intimate ties with the rulers of both heaven and earth, and was much praised for his intellectual aspirations.[58]

Proba and Adelphius, according to mediaeval sources, had two children. These have been identified as Quintus Clodius Hermogenianus Olybrius (cos. 379) and Faltonius Probus Alypius (PUR 391). With a Christian poetess as mother and a father whose family may have also converted early in the fourth century, the religious affiliation of the two seems hardly open to doubt. Strangely enough, then, a famous passage of Prudentius (*C. Symm.* 554-7) refers to what has been interpreted as the conversion of Olybrius at an unspecified date.[59]

Modern prosopographies further marry Olybrius to Tyrrania Anicia Iuliana, and endow the couple with the most famous Proba of the fourth century, Anicia Faltonia Proba.[60] This is unlikely. Adelphius' wife was born in the early 320s, say c. 323. Her oldest son, Olybrius, held his first office, that of Proconsul Africae in 361. He may then have been a young man since the office marked the beginning of a senatorial career. The younger Proba married the famed Sex. Petronius Probus and had a son who by 371 was old enough to need text books like those sent by Ausonius for his education.[61] His date of birth can hardly be put later than 364, and he may have been born as early as 360. His mother would then have been at least 15, and would thus have been born in the late 340s. The two Probae could have been mother and daughter but hardly a grandmother and a granddaughter.

In a panegyric celebrating the joint consulship of the two sons of Proba and Probus in 395, Claudian praises the attention given by the family to the literary education of their children.[62] The family also engaged in a variety of Christian activities, from intervention in ecclesiastical politics to building projects.[63] Anicia Faltonia Proba was

known for her *fides* and *nobilitas antiqua,* not to mention her reputation as an *ornamentum Anicianae familiae,* as well as an *exemplum docendae castitatis.*[64] After the death of her husband c.390 and the early demise of her consular sons (c.405) she became the mainstay of the Anicii at Rome, where her piety and support of the Christian community at large earned her the admiration of leading theologians.[65] She also gained notoriety for her presumed part in admitting the Gothic hordes to Rome in 410, and had to leave Italy for Africa, where the *comes Africae,* Heraclian, did his utmost to cause her and her household numerous difficulties.[66]

In Africa, Proba stood by the side of her granddaughter in the highly publicised ceremony of untertaking the veil of consecrated virginity. The story is narrated with much embellishment by Jerome in a letter to Demetrias, Proba's granddaughter.[67] Apparently the young woman was to be married in Africa to a nobleman, but decided to reject the marriage in favour of perpetual virginity. Jerome presents Demetrias' inner deliberation while emphasising the inauspicious circumstances of the affair: "Will you on the shores of Libya, yourself an exile, accept an exile for a husband"?[68] Here is a curious echo of the cento's digression (415-28) with its references to hardships and an exile in Africa, if these were actual events. The family eventually managed to return to Italy, but the African episode may well have left the senior female members with a bitter taste and a longing to return home.

If one looks for a possible editor of the cento, Anicia Faltonia Proba appears as an eminent candidate for the task. Her education, familiarity with both pagan and Christian works, and demonstrable dedication to Christianity would have equipped her to edit and even expand the cento of her mother. Perhaps she even exercised her literary judgement to insert a digression in which the power of salvation was demonstrated with special poignancy in view of her own circumstances in Africa. The final prayer in the cento to see her descendants pure in their Christian faith may have been an addition which had special relevance to the events which occurred during the family's African exile and, more particularly, to Demetrias' conversion to a vow of virginity.

The cento of the first Proba, then, emerged as a manifestation of female Anician piety in a family that had known converts to Christianity for at least a generation.[69] If it was retouched, such revisions were introduced to reinforce the personal message of salvation through real commitment to the creed. As far as the contribution of Christian

women to the conversion of their male relatives is concerned, the example of Anician women shows that their impact has been exaggerated. On the other hand, while women did not initiate conversion, they certainly made a significant contribution to advertising and promoting the religious affiliation of their clan. The cento further reflects a consistent Anician policy of enlisting all their resources in the continuous aquisition of prestige, power and authority. Throughout the fourth century, the Petronii/Anicii studiously preserved the poetic output of their male members and encouraged the considerable literary talents of their female members. One lasting result of this concerted effort is the cento.

NOTES

[1] Particularly since P. Brown, 'Aspects of the Christianization of the Roman Aristocracy', *JRS* 51 (1961), 1-11. One dissenting voice is M.R. Salzman, 'Aristocratic Women: Conductors of Christianity in the Fourth Century', *Helios* 16 (1989), 207-20

[2] Among many such studies, J.W. Drijvers, 'Virginity and Asceticism in Late Roman Western Elites', in J. Blok and P. Mason, eds., *Sexual Asymmetry* (Amsterdam 1987), 241-71.

[3] D.M. Novak, 'Constantine and the Senate: An Early Phase of the Christianization of the Roman Aristocracy', *Ancient Society* 10 (1979), 271-310; T.D. Barnes, 'Christians and Pagans in the Reign of Constantius', in *L'Eglise et l'empire au IVe s.* (Entretiens Hardt) (Vandoeuvres-Geneve 1989), 301-337.

[4] Text in *CSEL* 16, 568-609, ed. C. Schenkl. English translation with commentary has been provided by E.A. Clark and D.F. Hatch, *The Golden Bough, the Oaken Cross. The Virgilian Cento of Faltonia Betitia Proba* (American Academy of Religion. Texts and Translations 5) (Ann Arbor 1981). Particularly useful is the recent analysis of W. Kirsch, *Die lateinische Versepik des 4.J.* (Berlin 1989), 117f.

[5] D. Shanzer, 'The Anonymous *Carmen contra paganos* and the Date and Identity of the Centonist Proba', *REAug.* 32 (1986), 232-48.

[6] The biblical sources are indicated by Schenkl in his edition. For a detailed description, Kirsch, 128.

[7] 23: *Vergilium cecinisse loquar pia munera Christi.*

[8] On the technique of the cento, F. Ermini, *Il centone di Proba e la poesia centonaria latina* (Roma 1909); F.E. Consolino, 'Da Osidio Geta ad Ausonio e Proba. Le molte possibilitá del centone', *Atene e Roma* 28 (1983), 133-51; D.F. Bright, 'Theory and Practice in the Virgilian Cento', *ICS* 9 (1984), 79-90; Kirsch, 119f.

[9] Isid. *vir. ill.* 22; *Orig.* 1.39.26. PLRE I, 732 (Proba 2); I. 192 (Clodius Celsinus signo Adelphius 6).

[10] PLRE I, stemma 24; A. Chastagnol, *Fastes*, 82-3 makes the poetess daughter of Petronius Probianus (PUR 331-3) and Demetrias, sister of Petronius Probianus (PUR 345-6) and aunt of Sex. Petronius Probus.

[11] Kirsch, 118 (c.350); R. Herzog, *Die Bibelepik der lateinischen Spätantike* I (München 1975), 3 (350s-370). A host of scholars following Amatucci opted for a date c.362, regard-

ing the cento as a reaction to Julian's anti-Christian legislation. A.G. Amatucci, *Storia della letteratura latina cristiana*[2] (Torino 1955), 131; C. Cariddi, *Il centone di Proba Petronia* (Napoli 1971), 18; R. Markus, 'Paganism, Christianity and the Latin Classics in the Fourth Century', in *Latin Literature of the Fourth Century*, ed. J.W. Binns (London 1974), 313; Clark/Hatch, 98-9. Proba's dates are hypothetical and based on the careers of her husband and children. Kirsch, 118, for c.322-c.370; Shanzer (above n.5), 242-3, for c.324-c.380.

[12] Schenkl, 513. Chastagnol, *Fastes*, 131f. (Adelphius) notes that the relations between Adelphius and the poetess are all based on the late evidence regarding the cento.

[13] Schenkl, 514.

[14] CIL 6.1754-5.

[15] Shanzer 241.

[16] The date of Jerome's letter is controversial. See, most recently, D.E. Trout, 'The Dates of the Ordination of Paulinus of Bordeaux and of his Departure for Nola', *REAug.* 37 (1991), 237-60. Sivan, 'The Last Gallic Prose Panegyric: Paulinus of Nola and Theodosius', *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* (fortcoming).

[17] Ep. 53.7: *Sola scripturarum ars est, quam sibi omnes passim vindicent: "scribimus indocti doctique poemata passim". hanc garrula anus, hanc delirus senex, hanc soloecista verbosus, hanc universi praesumunt, lacerant, docent, antequam discant.*

[18] P. Courcelle, 'Les exégèses chrétiennes de la quatrième églogue', *REA* 59 (1957), 310.

[19] Jerome may have picked up the cento in the early 380s when he was staying at Rome, although the Petronii and the Anicii did not number among his patrons or contacts.

[20] Shanzer (above n.5), 235 thinks that the archetype did not bear any ascription.

[21] These are, in chronological order, Faltonia Betitia Proba, Anicia Faltonia Proba, Anicia Proba (PLRE I, 731), and a fourth, unattested in PLRE, but mentioned in Al. Cameron, 'Probus' Praetorian Games', *GRBS* 25 (1984), 195.

[22] CIL 6.1712.

[23] Shanzer, above n.5; p. 244, for a date between 385 and 388.

[24] *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur*, eds. R. Herzog and P.L. Schmidt, 5 (1989), 337, rejects Shanzer.

[25] *Cento Nuptialis, Ausonius Paulo.* (R.P.H. Green, *The Works of Ausonius* (Oxford 1991), p. 132-4), and above n.7.

[26] D. Shanzer, 'The Date and Composition of Prudentius' *Contra Orationem Symmachi Libri', Rivista di Filologia* 117 (1989), 443-4, with some useful observations.

[27] S. Döpp, 'Prudentius' *Contra Symmachum*, eine Einheit?' *VCh.* 40 (1986), 66-82.

[28] Shanzer, op. cit. (n.26), 442-62.

[29] T.D. Barnes and R.W. Westall, 'The Conversion of the Roman Aristocracy in Prudentius' *Contra Symmachum', Phoenix* 45 (1991), 50-61. I wonder if the interpolation was introduced by an Anician editorial hand.

[30] *Theodosio Augusto Ausonius; Griphus. Ausonius Symmacho; Technopaegnion.* H.G. Evelyn White, *Ausonius* (Loeb), I, XXXV. H. Sivan, 'The Dedicatory Presentation in Late Antiquity. The Example of Ausonius', *ICS* 17 (1992), 83-101.

[31] Some manuscripts of Ausonius transmit a letter by the emperor Theodosius which may have preceded an imperial edition, Evelyn White, I, XXXVII.

[32] Vs. 13-5. Note that when Ausonius complied with Probus' wish to send him texts for

the education of his son, he ensured that the lengthy dedication bore a distinct reference to himself (Ep. 9, 74f., Green).

[33] *Anth. Lat.* I, 783; Novak (above n.3), 299; Shanzer (above n.5), 247.

[34] Claudian, CM 40; Symmachus, Ep. 5.67; GrLat. VII, 449-514; W. Taegert, *Claudius Claudianus Panegyricus dictus Olybrio et Probino* (München 1988), 28.

[35] D.M. Novak, *'Anicianae domus culmen, nobilitatis culmen', Klio* 62 (1980), 477f., on Probus in the eastern court.

[36] Reinforced by the asymmetrical structure of the table of contents which is punctuated three times by *hic*, once to mark the beginning of the OT events (line 5) and twice to mark the NT part (lines 7 and 10).

[37] Although Schenkl ascribed all manuscripts to one archetype, some of the manuscripts do not carry the dedication to Arcadius, Shanzer (above n.5), 234-5.

[38] Kirsch, 124-5.

[39] *HLL* (above n.24), 338; Shanzer (above n.5), 232-3.

[40] Novak (above n.3), 290 on a possible connection between the two men through marriage between Proculus and Adelphia, a Christian woman from Sicily.

[41] J. Matthews, *The Roman Empire of Ammianus* (Baltimore 1989), 36 and passim on treason and *maiestas*.

[42] A century later, in 458, Sidonius Apollinaris offered a panegyric to a man implicated in the murder of his father-in-law, in order to exonerate his city, Lyon, from possible retaliation under the new regime (C. V., to Majorian). The plea helped.

[43] Shanzer, (above n.5), 233.

[44] Schenkl, 514.

[45] See the excellent analysis of A.M. Palmer, *Prudentius on the Martyrs* (Oxford 1989), 6f.

[46] Sivan (above n.30), passim.

[47] Cf. 334: *maius opus* with 45: *maior ordo*.

[48] Jerome, *vir. ill.*, 80 on the correspondence. T.D. Barnes, *Phoenix* 27 (1973), 149 on identifying Lactantius' Probus with Petronius Probianus.

[49] Novak, "Constantine and the Senate', 299.

[50] M.T.W. Arnheim, *The Senatorial Aristocracy in the Later Roman Empire* (Oxford 1972), 192.

[51] PLRE I, 68-9; stemma 24.

[52] Novak, 'Constantine', 296.

[53] Ibid.

[54] *Fastes*, 82-3.

[55] Novak, 'Constantine', 289-90. R. von Haehling, *Die Religionszugehörigkeit der hohen Amtsträger des römischen Reiches seit Constantins; I Alleinherrschaft bis zum Ende der theodosianischen Dynastie* (Bonn 1978), 372 claims that the case of Adelphius' creed remains an open question.

[56] Novak, 'Constantine', 305.

[57] *Praefatiuncula I. Ausonius lectori salutem* (Peiper). Cf. Ausonius' personal appearance in the *Mosella*, 438f.

[58] CIL 6.1756A; 5.3344; 6.1751,2.

[59] Barnes and Westall (above n.29), 59.

[60] PLRE I, 732, followed by many.

[61] Assuming that Probus was married once.
[62] *Cons. Pr. et Pro.*, 150f.
[63] Novak, *'Culmen' (above n.35), 291-2.*
[64] CIL 6.1755.
[65] Augustine, *Eps.*, 130, 131, 150; *de bono vid.*, 24; Rufinus apud Gennadius, *vir. ill.*, 17.
[66] Procopius, *BV*, 1.2.27; Jerome, Ep. 130.7.
[67] Jerome, Ep. 130.
[68] Ibid., 5, trans. W.H. Fremantle in NPN.
[69] Assuming the cento's earliest date is in the 350s, although it could have been later.

Dept. of Classics
Univ. of the Witwatersrand, Wits 2050 *Johannesburg*, South Africa

Vigiliae Christianae 47 (1993), 158-169, E.J. Brill, Leiden

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LISTS OF ROMAN BISHOPS IN THE ANTI-DONATIST POLEMIC

BY

ROBERT B. ENO

Since the Reformation, the early history of the Roman primacy has been a matter of emotional debate as well as of earnest study. Certain texts have been the object of intense scrutiny in the process. Among patristic works, the writings of Cyprian have remained a special locus of contention. His view of the role of Peter and his use of the phrase "the chair of Peter" in particular have fascinated generations of scholars and polemicists alike. In this essay, I will argue that Cyprian's view of Peter as the source and font of unity in the Church is still basic to the ecclesiology of the fourth century African author, Optatus of Milevis, and is still operative, albeit in a more vestigial fashion, in the anti-Donatist polemic of Augustine. Their use of the list of Roman bishops in such polemic derives ultimately from Cyprian's view of Peter's role as symbol of unity in the Church and is less directly concerned with Roman primacy than most commentators have usually presumed.

The lists of bishops found in certain early Christian documents have been of interest for several reasons. Those investigating the origins of the monarchical episcopate seek to determine if the names given are historical. They try to clarify the functions of those called *episkopoi* at the end of the first century. The idea of succession preoccupies others. Succession lists furnished one of the cornerstones for Eusebius in constructing his *Church History*. It is clear that in the second century, the monarchical episcopate, joined with the claim to apostolic foundation for certain sees, became a key element in elaborating a defence against Gnosticism.

Though Hegesippus spoke of making a *diadoche* of the bishops of Rome, when his text was cited by Eusebius, no list was given. It was left to Irenaeus to pass on the earliest list still extant. He argued that someone seeking to know the teaching of Jesus should go, not to the Gnostic

masters, but to the Christian communities historically founded in the first century by the Apostles. He stressed that while there were a good number of such communities, especially in the east, for the sake of brevity, he would give only the list of the bishops of the outstanding community of apostolic foundation, Rome. The significance of his argument as well as of the list itself have long been debated. Apart from the list, the meanings of certain words such as *principalitas* have been the occasion for much research. In recent decades *principalitas* has been widely accepted as linked to the idea of "nobility or prestige of origin", referring, of course, to the founding of the Roman church by Peter and Paul and not simply an indication of priority, historical or hierarchical.[1]

Irenaeus' work in turn is usually considered to have been the foremost influence on Tertullian as the latter formulated his attack against heresy in the *De praescriptione haereticorum*. Seekers after truth, such as the Gnostics claimed to be, are invited to make better use of their time and curiosity by consulting their local see of apostolic origin. While he refers to bishop lists as part of his argumentation, Tertullian, unlike Irenaeus, did not actually give any. He did, however, introduce the notion of the "chair" of the Apostles, a term that will become more vital in the writings of Cyprian. Similarly, his use of *principalitas* in *De praescriptione* 31.1 may also be revelatory of how Cyprian uses a related word in his letter 59.14.[2]

As is well-known, in his Montanist period, Tertullian limited the Petrine privileges to Peter personally, denying that such powers were passed on to any successor or group of successors such as the bishops of the institutional Church. The position against which Tertullian is arguing seems to be the belief on the part of some that Peter functioned as the representative of the Church. What he received from Christ was meant for the Church, of which Peter was the symbol.[3]

Cyprian

The next great African author after Tertullian was Cyprian. Today, most scholars agree with the conclusions of Maurice Bevenot[4] that in chapter four of the *De unitate ecclesiae*, Peter, because he is temporally the first to receive the authority that Christ gives to his Church, becomes for Cyprian the symbol of the unity of the Church. The Church is and must remain one because of the oneness of Peter at its origin. "...Ut unitatem manifestaret, unitatis eiusdem originem ab uno incipientem

sua auctoritate disposuit." "...Unam tamen cathedram constituit et unitatis originem adque rationem sua auctoritate disposuit."[5]

There is nothing strange about this unity of the Church; unity is a quality of God and thus should be characteristic of everything associated with God. "Deus unus est et Christus unus et una ecclesia et cathedra una super Petrum Domini voce fundata." Throughout Cyprian's writings, certain key words are closely associated with this reasoning about the unity of the Church: *origo, radix, matrix, caput, ratio.* But that the words are not confined solely to an ecclesiological context can be seen from a remark in his treatise against Demetrianus: "...Comites tibi plures radicis adque originis tuae pullulatione fecisti."[6]

In letter 48 to Cornelius, Cyprian mentions that he has urged those travelling to Rome to be very careful about which party in the city they approach for fellowship. He exhorted them "...ut ecclesiae catholicae matricem et radicem agnoscerent ac tenerent." The *matrix* and *radix* here do not refer to the Roman church as such but the "womb and root" are the Catholic Church. Since there is a schism in the Christian community of Rome, it is vital for Carthaginian Catholics to enter into communion with the Catholic community there. This is the community led by Cornelius, the bishop of the Catholic Church in Rome, not that of Novatian, the leader of a schismatic group.[7]

Other texts make it clear that Peter in his singularity is, precisely as symbol, the exemplar and font of the Church's unity. "... Quando et baptisma unum sit et Spiritus Sanctus unus et una ecclesia a Christo Domino nostro super Petrum origine unitatis et ratione fundata." To Jubaianus, Cyprian insists that he (and Catholic bishops everywhere) hold the *caput* and *radix* of the Church. This is a certainty. Catholic bishops hold the "rationis ac veritatis firmitatem." Later in the same letter, he reiterates: "Nam Petro primum Dominus, super quem aedificavit ecclesiam et unde unitatis originem instituit et ostendit..." In the Latin translation of his letter to Cyprian, Firmilian of Caesarea spoke of the *fundamentum unius ecclesiae* laid by Christ on Peter.

The *De unitate* makes use of this same vocabulary. The Devil helps to stir up dissension in the Church "...dum ad veritatis originem non reditur, nec caput quaeritur..." This is stated at the end of chapter three. He then proceeds at the beginning of the following chapter to cite the *probatio facilis* for this claim. The proof is none other than the text Matt 16: 18-19.[8]

The text of letter 59.14 is of fundamental importance for our ques-

tion. It is the one place where Cyprianic speculation about the symbolic significance of Peter for unity seems to touch the contemporary church of Rome. Carthaginian schismatics, not content with the trouble they have caused in Africa, have now set sail for Rome "...ad ecclesiam principalem unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est..." I will not linger over discussions of the meaning of *principalis* and cognate forms but, suffice it to say that I use it as does G. Clarke when he translates the phrase as "the primordial church". As mentioned earlier, such a translation clearly is related to the now commonly accepted interpretation of Irenaeus' use of *principalitas* in *Adversus haereses* III.3.2 when he speaks of the Roman church's *potior principalitas*, referring to its extraordinary foundation by the two leading apostles.

The church of Rome is Peter's church historically although it is not literally the primordial church; only the church in Jerusalem fulfills that role in history. I believe that here Cyprian is invoking once again his customary reference to Peter as the person whose oneness is both the symbol and the source of the unity of the Church. Here in letter 59.14 he extends the symbolic reference to incorporate Peter's church as the source of unity thus making Rome the symbolic primordial church, the *Urkirche*. As the remainder of section 14 of letter 59 indicates, such symbolic reasoning has no bearing on questions of possible Roman authority over the rest of the Church.[9]

We cannot leave Cyprian without insisting one final time on the significance for him of Peter as the symbol of that essential characteristic or mark of the Church, its unity. I believe that Cyprian's own statement in his letter 33 provides a key to his extension of the oneness of Peter-unity of the Church symbolism to include Peter's own Church. "Dominus noster...episcopi honorem et ecclesiae suae rationem disponens in evangelio loquitur et dicit Petro...(Matt 16: 18-19)...Inde per temporum et successionum vices episcoporum ordinatio et ecclesiae ratio decurrit ut ecclesia super episcopos constituatur et omnis actus ecclesiae per eosdem praepositos gubernetur."[10]

Optatus of Milevis

Why does Optatus include a list of the bishops of Rome in his anti-Donatist polemic? I maintain that he does so because he is still operating very much within the framework of Cyprian's ecclesiology. The list is not primarily about succession as such but it is included because it is the

list of the bishops of Peter's "primordial church" as in Cyprian's letter 59.14. It should be read as the extension and updating of the basic contention of Cyprian that Peter is the symbolic person at the origins of the Church, the person whose oneness grounds the unity of the Church throughout history.

When Optatus wrote a century after Cyprian, the situation of the Church had changed in several ways. Obviously the position of the Church in relation to the empire had altered radically. The Christian population had vastly increased. The ecclesiological arguments formulated by Cyprian in the face of local schism were no longer adequate for the new reality of the region-wide schism of the Donatists.

Nevertheless, the theological framework within which Optatus thought and wrote was still largely shaped by Cyprianic concepts and vocabulary. For example, though the Donatist schism was widespread, the theological arguments about the *dotes*, a concept suggested by Parmenian, revolved principally around the *cathedra* of one see, Carthage. While Optatus begins his second book with an argument confronting the new reality of his own time, viz. an argument from geographic catholicity over against the Donatists' isolation and remnant theology, still he speaks in Cyprianic terms of the "cathedra Petri vel Cypriani". The whole argumentation over the *dotes* revolves around the question of the *cathedra* and Optatus can claim: "...per cathedram Petri, quae nostra est, per ipsam et ceteras dotes apud nos esse."[11]

From the point of view of vocabulary as well, Optatus' thought can be seen as still strongly Cyprianic. For example the use of *radix*. For Optatus as for Cyprian, the root is the Catholic Church. North African Catholics, Optatus asserts, remain *in radice* with the whole world. Conversely, the Donatists have cut themselves off from the root. Severed from the root of Mother Church, the Donatist community in the city of Rome together with their bishop is but a "ramus ... vestri erroris, protentus de mendacio, non de radice veritatis."[12]

Cyprian had argued against Novatian that his *cathedra* was of his own creation, since Cornelius now lawfully occupied the sole legitimate *cathedra* of the Roman church. So, in a similar fashion, Optatus argued that the chair of Parmenian's predecessor, Maiorinus, had no source of existence (*origo*) before he undertook to sit in it. The Donatists are a river without a source. The word *origo* is also applied to the historic beginnings of the schism. In Optatus, *origo* and *caput* connote not simply a sense of temporal beginning but also the source, not just the

point where something starts but also the font out of which all later developments are drawn. Interestingly enough, the same point can be made about the word *princeps* and its cognate forms found in Optatus. Peter is the Catholic *princeps. Principes tui*, on the other hand, are not just the first Donatist leaders but the source and origin of all later troubles.[13]

For this essay, the key passage in Optatus is that found early in book II where the list of Roman bishops is given. Here, I believe, the essential thought and base of argumentation remain those of Cyprian, especially as found in his letter 59.14. "...in urbe Roma Petro primo cathedram episcopalem esse conlatam, in qua sederit omnium apostolorum caput Petrus, unde et Cephas est appellatus." *Caput* here means font and source as much as chief. The reason given by Optatus for Christ's choice of Peter is exactly the same as Cyprian's reasoning in *De unitate* 4: "...in qua una cathedra unitas ab omnibus servaretur, ne ceteri apostoli singulas sibi quisque defenderent, ut iam scismaticus et peccator esset, qui contra singularem cathedram alteram conlocaret."[14] Then, in Optatus' text, the list of Roman bishops follows.

Bringing forward the argument from geographic catholicity, Optatus notes that North African Catholics are in communion with this see of Rome. But then he challenges the Donatists not to show first of all whether they are in communion with Rome, but to demonstrate the origin of their chair. They do not have the *dos* of the *cathedra* because their first bishop did not sit on the chair of Peter, i.e. the chair of Cyprian.

Finally, in II.4 comes the question of the so-called Donatist succession in Rome. Did Macrobius sit on the chair of Peter? Was he the lawful bishop of Rome? Did he sit in the place of the real contemporary bishop of Rome? Obviously not. He sat only in the same place his immediate predecessors sat, going back to Victor of Garba, the first immigrant African leader of the small Donatist community in Rome.[15]

Though plainly a new element has entered the theological picture because of the argument from geographic catholicity, the same basic ecclesiology of Cyprian still prevails in Optatus. Communion with Rome, the most important and sole apostolic see of the west, is emphasized in order to highlight the isolation of the Donatists in North Africa. In itself, being in communion with Rome does not necessarily make any statement about primacy. The list of Roman bishops is introduced into the argument and it is brought forward to Optatus' day

because it constitutes an extension of Cyprian's statement about Peter's see as the *Urkirche*. The list also contrasts with the much briefer list of the Donatist bishops of Rome but its primary function is that it is the list of the bishops of Peter's symbolic primordial church.

Augustine

Moving forward to the time of Augustine, we should take note that the relevant material from his pen comes from his earlier period, i.e. c.400 and before. One may wonder whether, if the newly-baptized Augustine had been able to hold to his original resolve and had never become a priest or bishop, we would have learned from the writings of this intellectual monk that there was a phenomenon in the North African church at the time known as Donatism. As it happened, the recently converted Augustine turned pastor was forced to confront the not very philosophically inclined movement of Donatism. It is not surprising that he quickly embraced and made much use of previously existing materials, not only the works of Optatus but also, no doubt, of what was probably a long-standing body of Catholic apologetic against Donatism with standard arguments and proof-texts as well as documentation concerning the historical aspects of the quarrel.

To this material, Augustine soon contributed his own *Psalmus contra partem Donati* (c.393-96). The relevant stanza begins with the thought that to be able to live, one must cease being cut off from the vine and return to live *in radice*. Then at the very end of the stanza come the words:

> Numerate sacerdotes
> vel ab ipsa Petri sede
> et in ordine illo patrum
> quis cui successit videte:
> ipsa est petra quam non vincunt
> superbae inferorum portae.[16]

In his treatise against the fundamental letter of Mani (397), Augustine gave his reasons for rejecting the invitation to accept the writings of Mani as a sort of Scripture. The massive reality of the Catholic Church is a decisive factor in that rejection. With a very clear echo of Cyprian's letters 33.1 and 59.14, he says: "...tenet ab ipsa sede Petri apostoli, cui pascendas oves suas post resurrectionem Dominus commendavit, usque ad praesentem episcopatum successio sacerdotum..."

Returning to the debate with the Donatists, in his letter 43 (c.397-98) to several Carthaginian Donatists, he speaks of the importance of the see of Carthage at the historical origins of the controversy. It was linked to Rome "...in qua semper apostolicae cathedrae viguit principatus..." The word *principatus* in this phrase has traditionally been translated into English as "primacy" but within the context of the tradition of Cyprian's ecclesiology which, I maintain, is still alive in this early letter of Augustine, the word might more aptly, if not more felicitously, be translated as "primordiality". Augustine's phrase thus might be rendered: the Roman church, "in which the primordiality of the apostolic chair has always flourished..."

About two years later, in a letter to a Catholic of Cirta harassed by Donatists, Augustine ridicules Donatist claims (Letter 53, c.400). Catholics in Africa are in communion with the whole world so that alleged messages from angels demanding conversion to Donatism are to be ignored. The Donatist succession? What is that compared to the Catholic succession? "Si enim ordo episcoporum sibi succedentium considerandus est, quanto certius et vere salubriter ab ipso Petro numeramus, cui totius Ecclesiae figuram gerenti Dominus ait:..." There follows the text of Matt 16:18f. and the list of the Rome bishops up to Anastasius.

Presumably it would not have been difficult for Augustine to have furnished at least a partial list of the Catholic bishops of Cirta to illustrate his argument. But he did not. Rather the by now traditional list of Roman bishops, the bishops of Cyprian's primordial church, is given. The list and the argument were taken by Augustine from the African tradition as formed largely by Cyprian. But at this later date, to what extent can we be sure that Augustine himself is still consciously imbued with this traditional ecclesiology? It is difficult to be precise because we cannot read his mind.

There are clear indications that he no longer appreciated the full depth of the tradition he had inherited. For example, two observations are made by Augustine which go beyond the Cyprianic origins of the argument and are adapted to the need of his own day. He notes that no Donatist is to be found in the list, a reference presumably to the worthless argument derived from a so-called Donatist succession in Rome. Further, he says, no *traditor* is to be found there either, an allusion perhaps to the accusation that, during the persecution of Diocletian, one bishop of Rome was guilty of something worse than *traditio* in the

African sense, actual apostasy and idolatry, of betrayal by sacrificing to the traditional gods of Rome.[17]

One reason why the Cyprianic tradition may be weakening in Augustine is that it is still very strong among his opponents the Donatists. To be sure, they put much more emphasis on questions of origin than on the theme of unity. The whole vocabulary of *origo, radix* and *mater/pater* in the older usages is increasingly the property of the schismatics, as the objections of Petilian show. "Omnis res enim origine et radice consistit et, si caput non habet aliquid, nihil est..." On the third day of the conference of Carthage in 411, Petilian is still badgering Augustine with the question: Is Caecilian your father? In this matter too the Donatists could congratulate themselves on their literal, perhaps too literal, fidelity to Cyprian. Augustine's answers go beyond the old framework. Later in the *Contra litteras Petiliani* (400-02), Augustine replies to his antagonist in terms of geographic catholicity. The Donatists are not in communion with the chair of the Roman church in which Peter sat and in which Anastasius now sits nor with the chair of Jerusalem in which James once sat and in which John now sits. In this passage, succession is an issue but not solely that of Rome. In his argument from geographic catholicity, Augustine consistently appeals not only to the question of communion with Rome but also to communion with those eastern sees mentioned in the New Testament, in Paul's letters and in the Apocalypse.

So, while the elements of the Cyprianic argument are still in place in the early theological development of Augustine, the original meaning seems to have faded a great deal and what remains is there primarily as a vestige which he inherited. The older African tradition has yielded in Augustine to the changed circumstances of the Donatist controversy. Yet, interestingly enough, even as Cyprian's picture of Peter as the man whose oneness embodied the foundation of the Church's unity, faded, Augustine was himself developing his own version of Peter's symbolic significance, reverting in a way to the early Tertullian.

Very often for Augustine, Peter is the symbol of the Church as a whole, not just its unity, although certainly not excluding it. Peter speaks, *unus pro omnibus.* Peter receives; the Church receives. "Immo vero et in ipso Petro unitatem commendavit." Already in letter 53, he noted that the words of Jesus in Matt. 16:18 had been addressed to Peter as representing the whole Church. Without going any further into this, one can safely say that this usage is found with great frequency in Augustine.[18]

Conclusion

Most scholars are in agreement that Cyprian's use of the symbols of Peter and the Chair of Peter are not part of an argument in favor of Roman primacy. Indeed, many would claim that his views are inimical to such a development. In this essay, I have argued that the symbolic use of Peter and of Peter's church, the *ecclesia principalis*, plays an integral and foundational role in the African ecclesiology so heavily influenced by Cyprian. Further, I see Optatus of Milevis as firmly in line with Cyprian's ideas, so much so that when he introduces the list of Roman bishops into his anti-Donatist work, he is presenting them as the extension of Cyprian's Petrine symbolism, not primarily as a reference to the contemporary see of Rome and its primacy in the Church. The list fleshes out the thought of Cyprian expressed in letter 33. "(Matt 16:18-19)...Inde per temporum et successionum vices episcoporum ordinatio...decurrit..."

In his early anti-Donatist polemic, Augustine makes use of traditional material already to hand and, in one place, repeats the Roman bishop list. I believe that he does this primarily because this is what Catholic apologists before have done; it is the North African Catholic tradition. He seems, however, to have lost the full sense of the significance the symbolism once had for Cyprian.

In fine then, the lists are only indirectly a factor to be considered in the study of the development of the Roman primacy. Their first relevance is to the study of the development of the North African ecclesiology. As the remarks of the Donatist bishops show, the Africans attributed ultimate importance to origins, both as beginning and source. There is more continuity here than initially meets the eye.

Notes

[1] Irenaeus *Adversus haereses* III.3.1-3. SC 211.30-39. Comments and bibliography, SC 210.228-236. The text of III.3.2: "...ad hanc enim Ecclesiam propter potentiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam..."

[2] Tertullian *De praescriptione haereticorum* 36 CCSL 1.216. *Principalitas veritatis* vs. *Posteritas mendacitatis.* 31 CCSL 1.212.

It has usually been taken for granted that Irenaeus' statements in *Adv.haer.* III.3.2 should be understood as extolling the Roman church as the exemplar for the entire Church throughout the world. But others have recently argued that Irenaeus should be understood in the light of Tertullian who makes use of Irenaeus' ideas and who clearly sees Rome as the apostolic see of, and exemplar for, the Church in the west only. Cf. N. Brox, "Pro-

bleme einer Frühdatierung des römischen Primats' *Kairos* 18 (1976) 81-99. At about the same time as Brox, E. Lanne published an article: "L'église de Rome" in *Irénikon* 49 (1976) 275-322. Toward the end of the article (318ff.), he writes that a fragment of Irenaeus' work dating very close to the time of composition has been found in Egypt. Lanne concludes from this that the passage in question, *Adv.haer.* III.3, should be understood in a universal rather than in a merely local or western sense. In my view, the fragment of Irenaeus found in Egypt says something about the popularity of the work rather than about the intention of the author.

[3] Tertullian *De pudicitia* 21 CCSL 2.1328. Tertullian's opponents believe that because of Matt 16:18, the power of the keys has been given to the Church. In this context, the much discussed phrase occurs: "i.e. ad omnem ecclesiam Petri propinquam", p. 1327. In the earlier *Scorpiace*, 10.8, Tertullian himself seemed to accept the view that the Church received the keys from God through Peter. CCSL 2.1088.

[4] In addition to his critical edition of the *De unitate* in CCSL, Bevenot was the author of many studies on Cyprian. See, for example: "Episcopat et primauté chez S. Cyprien" *EphThLov* 42 (1966) 176-185. Bevenot's views have been widely accepted. See, for example, Michael Fahey, *Cyprian and the Bible* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1971). (Concerning Cyprian's use of Matt 16:18f p. 309) "The text as Cyprian uses it, is not cited to argue a form of jurisdictional primacy for the Roman bishop; rather it is cited to emphasize the oneness of the Church founded by Christ first upon the person of Peter in order to provide an effective symbol of its oneness."

[5] Both citations are from ch. 4 of the *De unitate.* (CCSL 3.251) The first text comes from the TR or revised text in Bevenot's reading; the second from the PT or original version of Bevenot's now widely accepted view.

[6] Cyprian *ep.* 43.5 Budé ed. Bayard p. 107; *Ad Demetrianum* 2 CCSL 3A.36.

[7] Cyprian *ep.* 48.3 Bayard p. 118. There are still those who identify the *matrix* and *radix* with Rome as such. For example: A. Demoustier, "Episcopat et union à Rome selon saint Cyprien" *RechScRel* 52 (1964) 369; Charles Pietri, *Roma Christiana* Vol. 1, p. 306. (Bibliothèque des Ecoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome. Fs. 224) (Paris: Boccard, 1976).

[8] Cyprian, *ep.* 70.3 Bayard p. 255; *ep.* 73.2 p. 263; *ep.* 73.7 p. 266; *ep.* 75.16 p. 301. *De unitate* 3-4 CCSL 3.251. It should be noted that these remarks are made before the disputed section of chapter 4.

[9] Cyprian *ep.* 59.14. Bayard p. 183. G. Clarke ACW 46.82 with commentary and bibliography pp. 257-258 (1986). U. Wickert, *Sacramentum Unitatis* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1971) comments on earlier literature, especially in chapter 7. The most noteworthy earlier studies on the *ecclesia principalis* phrase are: H. Koch, *Cathedra Petri* (1930); B. Poschmann, *Ecclesia principalis* (1933) and P. Batiffol, *Cathedra Petri* (1938), a compilation of earlier essays.

[10] Cyprian *ep.* 33.1 Bayard p. 84.

[11] Optatus *Contra Parmenianum* I.10 CSEL 26.12; II.9 CSEL 26.45 respectively. On Optatus, see R. B. Eno, "The Work of Optatus as a Turning-point in the African Ecclesiology" *The Thomist* 37(1973) 668-685. The recent essay of Jane Merdinger, "Optatus Reconsidered" *StPat* 22.294-299, a paper given at the 1987 Oxford Patristic conference, seems to me to exaggerate the degree to which Optatus has been considered a champion of papal primacy.

[12] Optatus II.4 CSEL 26.37. Cf. also I.15,28 CCSL 26.18,31; III.9 CSEL 26.93; I.11 CSEL 26.14.

[13] The chair of Maiorinus: I.10 CSEL 26.12; "River without a source" II.9 CSEL 26.45; "*Principes vestri*" VI.3 CSEL 26.147; "Peter, Catholic *princeps*" II.4 CSEL 26.39; Donatist *principes, passim*, especially: I.21 CSEL 26.22.

[14] Optatus II.2-3 CSEL 26.36-37; cf. also VII.3 CSEL 26.170-171,173.

[15] Optatus II.3-4 CSEL 26.37-39.

[16] The introduction by Congar to the first volume of the anti-Donatist works of Augustine in the *Bibliothèque Augustinienne* (*BA*) is a treatise in itself. *BA* 29.9-133. Cf. his note on the use of Matt 16:18-19 on pp. 716-717. *Psalmus contra partem Donati* vss.238-240. *BA* 28.184.

[17] Augustine *Contra epistulam fundamenti* IV.5 *BA* 17.396; *ep.* 43.7 CSEL 34.90; *ep.* 53.2,3 CSEL 34.153-154. K. Baus' conclusion about the text of *ep.* 53 is debatable. See K. Baus, "Wesen und Funktion der apostolischen Sukzession in der Sicht des heiligen Augustinus" *Ekklesia*: Festschrift für Bischof Dr. Matthias Wehr. (Trier: Paulinus Verlag, 1962) pp. 137-148, esp. pp. 140-141.

[18] Augustine *Contra litteras Petiliani* II.V.10 *BA* 30.226 (The words are Petilian's.); *Gesta conlationis Carthaginiensis a.411* 221 SC 224.1162 (Ed. S. Lancel, 1975); *Contra litteras Petiliani* II.51.118 *BA* 30.382-384; *Sermo* 46.30 CCSL 41.555. On Peter as representative of the Church, see A. M. LaBonnardière, "*Tu es Petrus*. La péricope 'Matthieu 16,13-23' dans l'oeuvre de saint Augustin" *Irénikon* 34(1961) 451-499, especially 489-496; R. B. Eno "*Forma Petri-Petrus, Figura Ecclesiae*: The Uses of Peter" *Augustiniana (Mélanges van Bavel) 41(1991) 659-676.*

401 Michigan Ave. N.E., *Washington*, DC, U.S.A. 20017

Vigiliae Christianae 47 (1993), 170-191, E. J. Brill, Leiden

GOTTES WESEN, LOGOS, WEISHEIT UND KRAFT BEI ASTERIUS VON KAPPADOKIEN UND MARKELL VON ANKYRA

VON

MARKUS VINZENT

Asterius von Kappadokien war lange Zeit in völlige Vergessenheit geraten,[1] sein letztes Auftreten auf der Enkäniensynode von Antiochien im Jahr 341 ist bereits nur mehr unsicher bezeugt.[2]

Erst die Veröffentlichung einer Sammlung seiner Fragmente durch Gustave Bardy im Jahr 1926 — und leicht veränderter Form 1936 — hob Asterius aus der Versenkung.[3] Etwa gleichzeitig machte Marcel Richard die Entdeckung, Asterius, der Sophist, sei der Verfasser eines großen Korpus von *Psalmenhomilien*.[4] In den folgenden Jahren beschäftigte sich Richard weiterhin mit Asterius und den *Psalmenhomilien*, bis er 1956 die Edition der Psalmauslegungen samt einiger Predigten zur Osteroktav vorlegen konnte, die er Asterius, dem Sophisten, zuschrieb.[5]

Danach wurde es in der dogmengeschichtlichen Forschung um Asterius erstaunlicherweise wieder still; erstaunlich deshalb, weil nach den Ergebnissen von Richard ein unvergleichlich großes Korpus an Schriften für die Erforschung des frühen Arianismus neu bereit lag.[6]

Wiederentdeckt wurde Asterius für den frühen Arianismus erst durch die Forschungen von Robert C. Gregg, Dennis E. Groh und Maurice F. Wiles[7] und die Teilnehmer der »Ninth International Conference on Patristic Studies« in Oxford 1983, die ein neues Kapitel der Geschichte des frühen Arianismus aufschlagen wollten. Im Jahr 1985 folgte der Konferenz die Veröffentlichung eines Sammelbandes der Beiträge zu Asterius.[8] Man stellte heraus: »At the center of the Arian soteriology was a redeemer, obedient to his Creator's will, whose life in virtue modeled perfect creaturehood and hence the path of salvation for all Christians«.[9] Doch nicht alle Forscher überzeugte das neue Kapitel des soteriologisch-christologisch orientierten Früharianismus.[10] Zumindest aber war in der Folgezeit Asterius' Platz in der Dogmen- und Kirchengeschichtsschreibung gesichert.

Die Veröffentlichungen von Wolfram Kinzig zur Überprüfung der

Thesen Richards brachten wieder Bewegung in die Debatte; Kinzig wies Richards Zuschreibung des Korpus an Asterius, den Sophisten, zurück und plädierte für einen Asterius Ignotus vom Ende des 4./Anfang des 5. Jahrhunderts als Verfasser; er kam zu dem Schluß: »The hypothesis of Richard must therefore be seen as having been refuted«.[11] Karl-Heinz Uthemann unterzog inzwischen die Dissertation von Kinzig einer Radikalkritik: »Nach allem, was hier erörtert wurde, (dürfte Kinzig) vorschnell gewesen sein«.[12] Daß dies nicht das letzte Wort zu der Verfasserschaft der *Psalmenhomilien* war, beweist die Replik von Wolfram Kinzig auf die Rezension von Uthemann.[13] Im folgenden wird diese Diskussion nicht weitergeführt, aber Kinzigs Argumentation mag eine gewisse Stütze erwachsen durch die Feststellung, daß der asterianischen Theologie eine ausgesprochene Systematik zugrunde liegt, und — hierin sind sich alle einig — eine solche in den Psalmenhomilien nicht begegnet.

Der Ausgangspunkt für meine Beschäftigung mit Asterius und seiner Theologie bildete die Untersuchung der pseudoathanasianischen *Oratio IV contra Arianos* (Ps.-Ath., *c. Ar. IV*). Aus der Lektüre dieses Textes wuchs die Erkenntnis, daß die »antiarianische« bzw. »antieusebianische« Position der ersten Kapitel dieser Schrift vor allem eine »antiasterianische« ist. Zum einen erweisen dies die inhaltlichen und sprachlichen Berührungen zwischen der in *c. Ar. IV* 1-8 bekämpften Theologie und den bei G. Bardy herausgegebenen Fragmenten, zum anderen liegt es nahe, daß der Autor von *c. Ar. IV*, der, was in der modernen Forschung nicht mehr bestritten wird, diesen Traktat vor allem gegen Markell geschrieben hat, einleitend auch *den* eusebianischen Gegner zur Kenntnis nimmt, dessen Theologie Markell selbst ausführlich referiert, zitiert und zu widerlegen suchte: Asterius von Kappadokien.[14] Aus der Betrachtung von *Contra Arianos IV* wiederum wurde mir klar, daß die Theologie des Asterius eine Voraussetzung für das Verstehen markellischer Theologie ist.

1. *Der Ungewordene und Ewige und die zeugende und schöpferische Kraft »des« Gottes nach Asterius von Kappadokien*

1) Die Debatte zwischen Asterius von Kappadokien und Markell von Ankyra[15]

Wann der Streit zwischen Asterius von Kappadokien und Markell von Ankyra begonnen hat — vor oder nach Nicaea —, läßt sich heute nicht

mehr genau ermitteln. Ungewiß ist auch, wer von beiden den anderen zuerst namentlich angegriffen hat.[16] Asterius von Kappadokien jedenfalls hat bereits vor Nicaea eine theologisch wichtige Rolle gespielt: Athanasius zufolge steht er an der Wiege des Arianismus;[17] er wird von diesem der »Anwalt der Häresie« genannt,[18] und Arius, so betont Athanasius zweimal, habe Asterius nachgeschrieben bzw. habe von Asterius gelernt.[19] Umgekehrt behauptet Athanasius von Asterius nie, er habe von Arius Anleihen genommen, obwohl ihm in *De synodis* und *Contra Arianos I-III* sehr daran gelegen ist, Asterius als Arianer und Eusebianer zu entlarven und zu zeichnen. Daß Asterius vor dem Konzil von Nicaea als Theologe, nicht aber als Person bedeutsam war, hängt wohl mit der Schwäche zusammen, die einen Schatten auf ihn hat fallen lassen: Ums Jahr 303 war er in der Verfolgung des Maximianus Herculius gefallen und hatte geopfert.[20] Eine kirchenamtliche Laufbahn war ihm damit versagt. Auf einen Gefallenen konnten sich keine Gesinnungsgenossen berufen, und die theologischen Gegner brauchten keinen Laien, der sich selbst durch Abfall disqualifiziert hatte, zu verurteilen. Nur mit seinen Lehrmeinungen, die Einfluß ausübten, setzte man sich auseinander.

Die Lage änderte sich erst nach dem Konzil: Ob dies mit Asterius' Widerruf seiner Ableugnung in Zusammenhang steht, von der Philostorgius berichtet?[21] Zum Ärgernis für die Antiarianer setzte sich Asterius nach dem Konzil in einem Schreiben offensiv für Euseb von Nikomedien ein.[22] Außerdem konnte er auch in eusebianisch gesinnten Gemeinden als predigender Laie auftreten.[23]

Seine Verteidigungsschrift für Euseb ist zeitlich nicht genau datierbar, sie muß aber vor 330-335 entstanden sein. Dieser *Terminus ad quem* ergibt sich aus folgendem: Markell von Ankyra reagierte auf dieses Schreiben des Asterius und zitierte aus ihm. Letztlich scheint es dieser Brief des Asterius gewesen zu sein, der Markell dazu veranlaßt hatte, sein Buch gegen Asterius und andere Eusebianer zu verfassen. Dieses hatte er zwischen 330 und 335 Kaiser Konstantin überreicht.[24]

Auf Markells Versuch, die eusebianische Partei als ganze und insbesondere Asterius zu treffen, reagierte Euseb von Caesarea. Mit zwei Werken schaltete er sich in den Streit zwischen Asterius und Markell ein und verteidigte den eusebianischen Standpunkt gegen Markell; die asterianische Theologie erfuhr auf diese Weise direkte, wenn auch nicht kritiklose, bischöfliche Unterstützung. Zunächst verfaßte Euseb von Caesarea mit *Contra Marcellum* eine kurze kommentierte Zitatensammlung

aus Markells Werk, um dessen Irrtümer zu dokumentieren, bald danach schrieb er mit seinen drei Büchern *De ecclesiastica theologia* seine Widerlegung des Markell und die Darlegung der kirchlichen Theologie fort.[25]

Im Jahr 341 fand die eusebianische Enkäniensynode zu Antiochien statt, auf welcher der antimarkellische Standpunkt bekräftigt wurde. Die zentralen Formulierungen des zweiten und eigentlichen Credo dieser Versammlung sind, wie heute allgemein anerkannt wird, weitgehend aus dem Glaubensbekenntnis des Asterius übernommen.[26] Auch Asterius war wohl — wie oben bereits angedeutet — persönlich auf der Synode als Begleiter seines Heimatbischofs Dianius von Caesarea/Kappadokien anwesend. Als Nachfolger des bereits verstorbenen Euseb von Caesarea/Palästina nahm auch Akazius von Caesarea an der Synode teil. Akazius griff ebenfalls zur Feder — der Zeitpunkt ist nicht genau bestimmt —, um Asterius und seine Formulierungen, die die Synode fast wörtlich übernommen hatte, gegen Markell zu verteidigen.[27]

Als Markell im Jahr der Enkäniensynode (341) sich und seine Theologie mit einem Brief an Julius von Rom empfahl, setzte er sich nicht nur kritisch von zentralen Aussagen seines Gegners ab, sondern übernahm auch Passagen aus Asterius.[28]

Im markellisch gefärbten Serdicense von 342 lassen sich antiasterianische Formulierungen finden.[29]

Auch die Reden des Athanasius gegen die Arianer (*c. Ar. I-III*), deren Entstehungszeiten noch immer umstritten sind, spiegeln die heftige Auseinandersetzung mit den Positionen der Eusebianer im allgemeinen, vor allem aber mit den charakteristischsten Aussagen des Asterius.[30] Mit Ausnahme von Arius, der zur Zeit der Abfassung von *c. Ar. I-III* bereits verstorben ist, schreibt Athanasius nach eigenen Angaben mit Namen nur Asterius aus; in der dritten Rede gegen die Arianer ist Asterius von Kappadokien überhaupt der einzige Gegner, den Athanasius mit Namen nennt.

Eine weitere namentliche, zeitlich nicht datierbare Reaktion gegen Asterius liegt in der Schrift Ps.-Anthimus, *De sancta ecclesia* vor, die heute von den meisten Forschern dem Markell zugeschrieben wird.[31]

Welche zeitliche und inhaltliche Stellung die pseudoathanasianische vierte Rede gegen die Arianer im Streit zwischen Markell und Asterius einnimmt, und wer der Verfasser dieser Schrift ist, konnte bislang noch nicht übereinstimmend geklärt werden.[32]

Ausführlich tritt Athanasius noch einmal in den Schriften *De synodis*

und *De decretis Nicaenae synodi* gegen Asterius und seine Theologie an. In Kapitel 12 der *Epistula ad episcopos Aegypti et Libiae* bringt Athanasius eine Zusammenstellung von »arianischen« und »asterianischen« Texten, die in veränderter Form bereits in *Contra Arianos I* 5f. zu finden ist.[33] Da er in *De synodis* den Kappadokier allerdings biographisch breit einführen muß, wird Asterius wohl schon eine geraume Zeit vor 361/2, der Zeit der Abfassung dieses Werkes, verstorben sein.

Zusammenfassend läßt sich feststellen:
Asterius war wohl spätestens nach 325 in der Gruppe der Eusebianer der erste theoretische Kopf. Er war auf jeden Fall die theologische Persönlichkeit, gegen welche die nahmhaftesten Antieusebianer in den beiden Jahrzehnten nach dem Konzil von Nicaea geschrieben haben. Ein Markstein gegen diese Angriffe auf Asterius stellt die Enkäniensynode von 341 dar. Asterius wurde, wenn auch nicht kritiklos, von den bischöflichen Parteifreunden als Theologe anerkannt, seine Theologie von ihnen in weiten Teilen übernommen und durch sie verteidigt.

2) Die Lehre des Asterius vom »Ungezeugten« und »Ewigen« und der »ungezeugten Kraft ›des‹ Gottes«

Aus den asterianischen Fragmenten ergibt sich ein weitgehend kohärentes System.[34] Asterius hat philonische, origenistische und mittelplatonische Traditionen verarbeitet und in eine neue Form gegossen, die sich in ihrer theologischen Kontur von der Theologie seiner Väter, aber auch von der seiner Zeitgenossen Arius und Euseb von Caesarea, abhob und bei Aetius und Eunomius fortwirkte.[35] Aus seinem Konzept werden im folgenden die Überlegungen zur Definition des göttlichen Wesens und der zeugenden und schöpferischen Kraft »des« Gottes herausgegriffen und mit den Antworten verglichen, die dieses Konzept bei Markell von Ankyra provoziert haben.

a) Der »Ungezeugte« und »Ewige«:

Wie Arius unterscheidet auch Asterius zwischen »dem« Gott (ὁ θεός), der der ungezeugte und ewige Gott ist, und — artikellos — Gott, der der alleingewordene (μονογενής) und erstgeborene (πρωτότοκος) ist (cf. Asterius, *frg.* 64 (1/B.)).

Als wesensdefinierende Begriffe für »den« Gott gelten nach Asterius nur »ungezeugt/ungeworden« (ἀγέν[ν]ητος) und »ewig« (ἀίδιος) (cf.

Asterius, *frg.* 1-4 (7/B.)). Diesen entsprechen weitere negative Begriffe wie »anfangslos« (ἄναρχος) und »unsichtbar« (ἀόρατος) (cf. Asterius, *frg.* 62, 64 (1/B.), 66 (2a/B.)).

Dagegen sind von diesen eindeutigen und ausschließlich das Wesen »des« Gottes definierenden Begriffen alle weiteren Bezeichnungen »des« Gottes zu unterscheiden; der Ungezeugte und Ewige heißt z.B. auch »Ursprung« (αἴτιον), »Vater« (πατήρ), »Gott« (θεός), »Seiender« (ὤν), »Logos« (λόγος), »Weisheit« (σοφία), »Kraft« (δύναμις), Licht (φῶς), »Einziger« (εἷς), »Alleinige« (μόνος) u. ä. Zwar bezeichnen auch diese Begriffe »den« Gott in seinem Wesen, denn in »dem« Gott gibt es keine Eigenschaften und Akzidentien, aber sie definieren das Wesen »des« Gottes nicht eindeutig und ausschließlich. Sie können auch Gewordenen zugeschrieben werden, wie Asterius mit dem Hinweis auf die Schrift betont (cf. Asterius, *frg.* 46 (16/B.); 10 (21ab/B.)). Auch der Sohn heißt z. B. Anfang (ἀρχή), Einziger, Alleiniger, Logos, Weisheit, Kraft, Schöpfer und Erlöser (cf. Asterius, *frg.* 10 (21ab/B.); 34 (9/B.); 39 (32/B.)). Und es gibt unter den übrigen Gewordenen Einzige und Alleinige wie die Sonne und die Erde (cf. Asterius, *frg.* 24), Weise, Logos- und Kraftbegabte.[36]

Asterius denkt das Wesen »des« Gottes offensichtlich differenziert: Im strengen, definierenden Sinn ist das Wesen »des« Gottes nur mit unverwechselbaren, Kreaturen nicht zuschreibbaren Begriffen zu benennen. »Der« Gott ist, was Kreaturen nicht sein und nicht werden können. Er besitzt aber auch wesenhafte Merkmale und Bezeichnungen, die nicht sein Wesen im strengen Sinn definieren, sondern die seine nicht notwendigen, aus seiner Freigebigkeit und Wohltätigkeit, also aus der Freiheit seines Wesens, kommenden Fähigkeiten beschreiben: In diesen freien Wesenseigenschaften ist er Ursprung, Vater, Einziger, Schöpfer, Erlöser usw. (cf. Asterius, *frg.* 15 (5/B.)). Diese Eigenschaften und Bezeichnungen kommen ihm nicht erst anläßlich seines Wirkens hinzu, sondern eignen ihm wesenhaft, wenn auch nicht notwendig (cf. Asterius, *frg.* 14 (4/B.)).

Durch die Unterscheidung von ausschließlichen und wesensdefinierenden Begriffen und nichtausschließlichen wesenhaften, aber nicht notwendigen Bezeichnungen gelingt es Asterius, einerseits die relationslose Absolutheit und Nichtmitteilbarkeit des Wesens »des« Gottes, andererseits aber auch dessen Freiheit, väterliche Zeugungsfähigkeit und schöpferische Wirksamkeit zu begründen.[37] Alles Gewordene, allen voran der Alleingewordene und Erstgeborene, der Sohn, ist Bild »des«

Gottes, nicht aber in bezug auf die nichtausschließlichen Wesensbezeichnungen Gottes.

Diese Differenzierung im Gottesbegriff ist Asterius eigen und bildet ein erstes und grundlegendes Unterscheidungsmerkmal zu Arius. Der arianische Gottesbegriff umfaßt nämlich ohne Differenzierung auch die Einzigkeit, Alleinigkeit bzw. das *Monas*-Sein »des« Gottes; Arius eröffnet sein Credo mit οἴδαμεν ἕνα θεόν, bevor er »den« Gott als ungewordenen bekennt.[38] Weil Arius nicht zwischen nichtabbildbaren und abbildbaren Wesensmerkmalen »des« Gottes unterscheidet, können die Gewordenen, unter ihnen auch der Sohn, gegenüber dem Ungewordenen nur als unähnlich in allem bestimmt werden,[39] während Asterius im Gegensatz dazu im Hinblick auf den Sohn von einem »unveränderten Bild« »des« Gottes reden kann, ohne damit die Absolutheit »des« Gottes zu gefährden (cf. Asterius, *frg.* 10 (21a/B.)).

b) Die Ursächlichkeit »des« Gottes und seiner immanenten Fähigkeiten des Logos, der Weisheit und der Kraft:

Entsprechend der dargelegten Definition des göttlichen Wesens wird auch Gottes Ursächlichkeit von Asterius differenziert gedacht: »Der« Gott is *in seinem eigentlichen* Wesen (als Ungewordener und Ewiger), aber nicht *aufgrund dieses* Wesens Schöpfer, Offenbarer und Erlöser. Er selbst ist Demiurg, sein Schaffen geschieht aber aus Wille und Wollen, nicht aus seinem Sein heraus: »Aber siehe«, sagt Asterius, »›der‹ Gott ist immer Schöpfer, und die Kraft zum Schaffen ist ihm nicht hinzugekommen« (Asterius, *frg.* 22); »auch vor der Zeugung des Sohnes hatte der Vater die Fähigkeit des Zeugens als vorher existierende« (Asterius, *frg.* 14 (= *frg.* 4 Bardy)). Wirksam wird das göttliche Wesen aber erst aufgrund freien Willensentscheides: »Aus wohltätiger Freigebigkeit wurde der Sohn geschaffen, und durch einen Überfluß an Kraft bildete ihn der Vater« (Asterius, *frg.* 15 (= *frg.* 5 Bardy)); denn »wenn das Wollen ›des‹ Gottes der Reihe nach alle Geschöpfe durchwaltet hat, ist offensichtlich auch der Sohn, der ein Geschöpf ist, durch den Willen entstanden und gebildet« (Asterius, *frg.* 16 (= *frg.* 6 Bardy)). Wille und Wollen können diesem Gott, dem Demiurgen, nicht abgesprochen werden: »Sei es nämlich, daß es unwürdig ist, mit Willen zu bilden, dann ist das Wollen betreffs aller Dinge gleichermaßen aufzuheben, damit ihm die Würde unversehrt bewahrt bleibt. Sei es, daß ›dem‹ Gott das Wollen ziemt, dann soll er die Vorzüglichkeit auch beim ersten Erzeug-

nis besitzen. Denn es ist doch nicht möglich, daß ein und demselben Gott bei denen, die geschaffen werden, der Wille angemessen ist und das Nichtwollen zukommt« (Asterius, *frg.* 19 (= *frg.* 15 Bardy)). Aufgrund von Wille und Wollen schafft ›der‹ Gott, doch nicht er selbst in seinem Sein, sondern durch seine eigentlich verursachenden Fähigkeiten und abbildenden Kräfte, durch den Logos, die Weisheit und die Kraft »des« Gottes (cf. Asterius, *frg.* 14-16 (4-6/B.); 64 (1/B.)).

Asterius sieht die Ursächlichkeit »des« Gottes im begriff »Vater« angezeigt. Er formuliert in Fragment 64 (1/B.) mit folgenden Worten: »Er (Paulus) verkündet, daß die ewige Kraft »des« Gottes selbst die ... sei, die ihm (»dem« Gott) innewohnt und mit ihm ungezeugt zusammen existiert, die einerseits zeugen kann, nämlich Christus, andererseits den ganzen Kosmos schaffen kann ... Seine Kraft und Göttlichkeit [ist] ... der Vater, der gezeugt hat.«

»Vater« ist also die ewige Kraft (und Göttlichkeit), die in Röm 1,20 Erwähnung findet. Ihm steht die andere, gezeugte und damit kreatürliche Kraft, Christus, gegenüber (Schriftbeleg 1 Kor 1,24). Strenggenommen zeugt nicht der Ungezeugte den Gezeugten, da dieser nicht aus dem Wesen des Ungezeugten gezeugt ist, sondern der Ungezeugte zeugt durch seine ungezeugte und ewige Kraft die gezeugte und geschöpfliche Kraft, den Sohn und Christus. »Die ewige Kraft ›des‹ Gottes« schafft ein unverändertes Bild von sich, nämlich die »Kraft Gottes«, um so das Unsichtbare »des« Gottes für die Vernunft in dem Geschaffenen wahrnehmbar zu machen; die andere, gezeugte Kraft ist es, das unveränderte Bild »des« Gottes, »die sich durch Christus zeigt und durch die Werke selbst seines Dienstes erkannt wird« (Asterius, *frg.* 64 (1/B.)). »Der« Gott zeugt und schafft nicht aus seinem Wesen oder Sein heraus, sondern aus freiem Willen, aus göttlicher Kraft (cf. Asterius, *frg.* 26 (8/B.)). Die Gemeinsamkeit zwischen Ungezeugtem und Gezeugtem, Ungewordenem und Gewordenem in den Namen (ungezeugter Logos, Einziger, Vollkommener, König, Herr, Gott usw. und gezeugter Logos, Einziger, Vollkommener, König, Herr, Gott usw.) beruht auf Teilgabe und Abbildhaftigkeit. »Dem« Gott kommen die Namen wesenhaft zu, der Gewordene wird nur uneigentlich so genannt (cf. Asterius, *frg.* 71).

Als Schriftbelege für diese Lehre dienen, wie angedeutet, insbesondere 1 Kor 1, 24 und Röm 1, 20: Der »dem« Gott immanente Logos, die Weisheit und »die Kraft ›des‹ unsichtbaren Gottes« aus Röm 1, 20 ist nicht gleichzusetzen mit der in 1 Kor 1, 24 von Paulus artikellos ein-

geführten Weisheit und Kraft Gottes, welche der gezeugte und geschaffene Sohn und Christus ist (cf Asterius, *frg.* 54 (1/B.)).

c) Die Gewordenen:

Die Gewordenen bestimmen sich ihrem Wesen nach aus dem Gegensatz zum Ungewordenen und Ewigen.[40]

Während vom Ungewordenen per se gilt, es »sei das nicht Geschaffene, sondern ewige Seiende« (Asterius, *frg.* 2 (7/B.)), muß umgekehrt aus dem Werden der Gewordenen geschlossen werden, daß alle Gewordenen geschaffen wurden und nicht waren, bevor sie wurden; im Gegensatz zur ungezeugten Kraft »des« Gottes existieren sie nicht ewig zusammen mit »dem« Gott, auch wenn Gott immer schon Vater war (cf. Asterius, *frg.* 22). Asterius verdeutlicht dies anhand der Analogie mit dem Arzt. Es ist jemand Arzt aufgrund seiner Fähigkeiten und unabhängig davon, ob er heilt oder nicht, entsprechend hatte der Vater »auch vor der Zeugung des Sohnes ... die Fähigkeit des Zeugens als vorher Existierende« (Asterius, *frg* 14 (4/B.)). Das Verhältnis zwischen Ungewordenem und Gewordenen ist nicht korrelativ, denn das Ungewordene ist auch ohne Gewordene.

Die Relation vom Ungewordenen zu den Gewordenen ist darüber hinaus einzig und nicht gleichzusetzen mit dem allgemeinen Verhältnis zwischen Ursache und Verursachtem, Schaffendem und Geschaffenem, Zeugendem und Gezeugtem, Vater und Sohn. Denn auch die Gewordenen können verursachen, schaffen, zeugen und Väter werden, insofern »der« Gott sie an seinen entsprechenden Fähigkeiten teilhaben läßt. Ein Gewordener, der zeugt, ist darum aber kein Ungewordener, sondern bleibt ein Gewordener. Darum ist einerseits die Ungewordenheit das Spezifikum des Wesens »des« verursachenden Gottes, andererseits das Gewordensein das Spezifikum aller verursachten und verursachenden Gewordenen, unter ihnen auch des Sohnes.

Die Gewordenen wurden in zwei Schritten geschaffen: »Da ›der‹ Gott des Alls, als er die gewordene Natur schaffen wollte, sieht, daß sie die unabgeschwächte Hand ›des‹ Gottes und die Schöpfung durch ihn nicht ertragen konnte, bildet und schafft er zuerst allein einen alleinigen Einzigen und nennt diesen Sohn und Logos, damit, nachdem dieser ein Mittleres geworden war, so nunmehr auch das Ganze durch ihn entstehen könne« (Asterius, *frg.* 26 (8/B.)).

Der Sohn geht den übrigen Geschöpfen voraus und besitzt einen Vor-

rang durch die vorkosmische Herrlichkeit (προκόσμιος δόξα; cf. Asterius, *frg.* 36 (33/B.)), wenn er auch dem Wesen nach ein Gewordener, ein Geschöpf, dem Wesen nach Gott fremd und anders, eine andere Hypostase und eine andere Person ist (cf. Asterius, *frg.* 52-54 (27/B.; 25/B.; 30/B.)). Als Bild der Fähigkeiten »des« Gottes ist er, wie potentiell auch alle übrigen Geschöpfe, »dem« Gott gegenüber nicht völlig ungleich, sondern kann als »Vollkommener« und »König« und »Herr« und »Gott« sogar das unveränderte Bild des Vaters genannt werden (Asterius, *frg.* 10 (21ab/B.); 46 (16/B.)).

Vermittels des vorkosmisch gezeugten Sohnes schafft »der« Gott das All und alle übrigen Gewordenen; die Bedeutsamkeit des Sohnes beschränkt sich aber auf die Mithilfe beim Werk des Vaters; der Sohn schwächt die Hand des Vaters für die übrigen Geschöpfe ab und macht damit die väterliche Kraft erträglich. »Er (der Sohn) ist zwar ein Geschöpf und gehört zu den Gewordenen; wie von einem Lehrer und Handwerker aber hat er das Schaffen gelernt und so dient er auch »dem« Gott, der [ihn] gelehrt hat« (Asterius, *frg.* 34 (9/B.)). Aufgrund seines unvermittelten Geschaffenseins und dieser Relation zu »dem« Gott heißt der Sohn Alleingewordener (μονογενής), aufgrund seiner Relation zu den übrigen Geschöpfen, denen er als erster der Gezeugten vorausgegangen ist, heißt er Erstgeborener (πρωτότοκος). Aufgrund der von »dem« Gott in ihn gegebenen Fähigkeiten und Wirkungen heißt er auch Logos, Weisheit und Kraft Gottes (cf. Asterius, *frg.* 38 (13/B.); 72 (10a-c/B.)).

Entsprechend dem Schöpfungswerk kommt dem Sohn auch im Erlösungswerk eine dienende, vermittelnde Funktion zu. Der Vater gibt die Kraft, der Sohn führt die Werke des Vater aus: »Ganz offenkundig nämlich hat er (der Sohn) deshalb gesagt, daß einerseits er im Vater ist, andererseits in ihm wieder der Vater ist (cf. Joh. 14,10; Joh 10,38), weil er sagt, daß weder das Wort, welches er aussprach, sein eigenes sei, sondern das des Vaters, noch die Werke seine eigenen seien, sondern die des Vaters, der die Kraft gegeben hat« (Asterius, *frg.* 38 (13/B.)). Und »auch durch Mose führte er [»der« Gott] das Volk aus Ägypten und durch ihn, obwohl auch er ein Mensch ist, hat er das Gesetz gegeben, so daß es möglich ist, daß durch den Gleichen das Gleiche geschieht« (Asterius, *frg.* 47). Wenn das Prinzip gilt, daß »der« Gott in seiner Göttlichkeit für die Geschöpfe in Schöpfung und Erlösung unerträglich ist und durch »den Gleichen das Gleiche« wird, muß der Mittler auf der Seite der Geschöpfe stehen und selbst Geschöpf sein. Der von Gott

gezeugte bzw. geschaffene Sohn ist deshalb — wie alle anderen Gewordenen — dem Wesen nach den Ungewordenen gegenüber anders und fremd, und der Hypostase und der Person nach ein zweiter. Das bedeutet nicht, daß der Sohn — wie potentiell wohl auch alle übrigen Gewordenen — dem Ungewordenen gegenüber in allem unähnlich ist: Anders ist der Sohn gegenüber »dem« Gott in bezug auf die Definition und Eigentlichkeit des Wesens (cf. Asterius, *frg.* 63; 74), unverändertes Abbild dagegen ist er vom Wesen »des« Gottes bezüglich der abgebildeten Merkmale, von Willen, Kraft und Herrlichkeit (cf. Asterius, *frg.* 10 (21ab/B.)).

Darum ist es nur konsequent, wenn der Sohn Mensch ist. Wie zitiert, wurde dem Sohn vom Vater Logos, Weisheit und Kraft gegeben (cf. Asterius, *frg.* 38). Als gegebener und nicht von Natur aus im Sohn seiender Logos ist der Logos des Sohnes ein kreatürlicher Logos, die Kraft des Sohnes eine furchtsame, seine Weisheit eine erst im Laufe des menschlichen Lebens allmählich gewachsene, die ihm vom Vater gelehrt wurde und die er erlernt hat; sein Logos läßt ihn am Kreuz rufen: »Mein Gott, mein Gott« (Mt 27,46) und ihn sagen: »Mir wurde gegeben« (Mt 28,28; Joh. 5,22; Joh 3,35f.; Mt 11,27; Lk 10,22; Joh 5,30; Joh 6,37; cf. Asterius, *frg.* 74).

2. *Der Einzige und dessen Ursächlichkeit nach Markell von Ankyra*

Markells Theologie als Antwort auf Asterius zu lesen, ist erstaunlicherweise neu. Diese Art der Lektüre rechtfertigt sich und zwingt sich geradezu auf durch die Tatsache, daß bis auf den Brief Markells an Julius von Rom alle erhaltenen Fragmente seinem Werk entstammen, das er gegen die Eusebianer, allen voran aber gegen Asterius von Kappadokien geschrieben hat. Insbesondere gegen Asterius und die von ihm aufgeworfenen Fragen, Schriftinterpretationen und Theologumena entwickelte Markell seine eigenen Positionen, wie der oftmalige Verweis auf seinen Gegner, die vielfältigen Zitate und Referate aus Asterius und seine häufigen Bezugnahmen auf ihn belegen.

Asterius blieb in der Markellforschung bisher weitgehend unberücksichtigt; man beleuchtete die Theologie Markells vornehmlich im Kontext von Eusebs Schriften *Contra Marcellum* und *De ecclesiastica theologia* und im Rahmen der das Werk Markells widerlegenden Zeugnisse von Zeitgenossen;[41] in den vergangenen Jahrzehnten wurde vor allem nach pseudonym überlieferten Markellschriften gesucht.[42] Allerdings

konnte bislang lediglich bei der Zuschreibung des kleinen Textes Pseudo-Anthimus, *De sancta ecclesia* an Markell ein gewisser Forschungskonsens erreicht werden. Das Manko der Forschung liegt auf der Hand: Wer das gegnerische Profil einer Streitschrift nicht zur Kenntnis nimmt, wird auch die Gegenpositionen in ihrer Intention kaum adäquat erfassen.

Dabei wollte Markell nach Ausweis der erhalten gebliebenen Fragmente seines Werkes ausdrücklich und detailliert Asterius' Theologie widerlegen.[43] Daß er dazu bei den Formulierungen seines Gegners ansetzte und im Laufe der Diskussion manchen Gedanken seines Gegners akzeptiert hat, wird die Darstellung der Definition des göttlichen Wesens und der göttlichen Dynamis zeigen.[44] Ein Ergebnis dieser Übereinstimmung war, so unterschiedlich und weitgehend konträr die Auffassungen von Asterius und Markell sonst sind, daß beiden von ihren Gegnern die gleichen Ketzerhüte aufgesetzt werden konnten und man sie bald Judaisierende und Sabellianer, bald Hellenisierende und Arianer genannt hat.[45]

a) Gott, der Einzige

Asterius bezeichnet Gott als den Ungezeugten und Ewigen.[46] Auch Markell glaubt wie Asterius, daß »der« Gott immer ist und niemals einen Seinsanfang besitzt,[47] und er betont seine Übereinstimmung mit Asterius: Die Ewigkeit »des« Gottes geht einher mit der Unterscheidung zwischen dem Ungewordenen und den Gewordenen. »Es ist offenbar, daß von uns und ihm [Asterius] gemeinsam bekannt wird, daß er [»der« Gott] ewig existiert und niemals einen Seinsanfang genommen hat, daß aber auch das, was von ihm geworden ist, aus dem Nichtsein geworden ist. Wenn einer sagt, es gäbe irgendwelche Ungewordene, glaube ich aber nicht, daß er [Asterius] dies glauben wird, sondern daß er völlig überzeugt ist, daß Himmel aber und Erde und alles, was im Himmel und auf Erden ist, von Gott geworden ist«.[48]

Markell gesteht, daß es nicht die Absicht des Sophisten war, von mehreren Ungewordenen zu sprechen. Beide glauben daran, daß es nur einen einzigen Ungewordenen/Ungezeugten gibt und alles Gewordene von Gott und aus dem Nichtsein geworden ist. Dabei klingen aber vorsichtig markellische Bedenken an anderen asterianischen Lehrstücken an. Denn er unterstreicht im Anschluß an das Zitierte die Einzigkeit Gottes und fordert, Asterius müsse auch dem zustimmen, daß »außer

Gott nichts anderes war; der im Vater seiende Logos folglich die eigene Herrlichkeit besaß«.[49] Asterius leugnet nicht die Einzigkeit »des« Gottes, aber sie war für ihn keine spezifische Gottesbezeichnung. Einzigkeit und Herrlichkeit kommen gnadenhaft auch dem hypostatisch von »dem« Gott getrennten Logossohn zu (cf. Asterius, *frg.* 36 (33/B.); ebd. 24).

In der Bewertung der Gottesprädikate folgt Markell Asterius nicht. Er läßt die Unterscheidung zwischen ausschließlichen und nichtausschließlichen Wesensmerkmalen Gottes fallen und betont, daß der Schrift entsprechend, die Einzigkeit Gottes allen anderen Bezeichnungen voran als das göttliche Prädikat gilt.[50] Gott ist für ihn »ein einziger«, »ein einziger Gott allein«, »ein alleiniger Gott«;[51] er nennt ihn markant die *Monas*.[52] » ›Ich‹ nämlich bin, sagt er [Gott], ›der erste Gott und ich bin nach allem und außer mir gibt es keinen anderen Gott‹ (Jes 44,6)«;[53] »deshalb sagte er [Gott] zu ihm, ›ich bin der Seiende‹ (Ex 3,14), damit er lehre, daß es außer ihm keinen anderen Gott gibt«.[54] Gott ist ein einziger, weil ausschließlich er ist und kein anderer der »Gerechte und Retter« ist,[55] kein anderer ist Schöpfer oder Demiurg.[56] Gott ist *Monas*, ein einziger Gott, weil es nicht einen einzigen anderen außer ihm gibt.[57] Gott ist ausschließlich einer, seine Ausschließlichkeit beinhaltet seine Einzigkeit. Es geht nicht um eine einzigartige und ausschließliche Gottesprädikation, sondern um eine Prädikation, die die Einzigkeit und Ausschließlichkeit Gottes selbst aus der Schrift aufweist.

b) Gott und sein Logos, seine Weisheit und Dynamis

Markell übernimmt von Asterius trotz seiner Kritik an dessen Gottesbegriff die asterianische Lehre vom ewigen Logos, der Weisheit und der Kraft »des« Gottes.

Selbst der Wortlaut, in welchem Markell von Ankyra von der Existenz des Logos, der Weisheit und der Kraft spricht, erinnert an Asterius' Formulierungen. Es heißt bei Markell, daß »der Vater zusammen mit Weisheit und Kraft durch den Logos alles zu schaffen sich erfreute«;[58] Asterius hatte »die ewige Kraft ›des‹ Gottes« gelehrt, »die ihm (»dem« Gott) innewohnt und mit ihm ungezeugt zusammen existiert, die einerseits zeugen kann, nämlich Christus, andererseits den ganzen Kosmos schaffen kann« (Asterius, *frg.* 64 (1/B.)). Gott ist für Markell — ebenfalls wie für Asterius — immer Vater.

Dem steht auch nicht entgegen, daß Markell die *Trias* erst als Weite-

rung der *Monas* denkt anläßlich des Ausgangs des Logos vom Vater, denn auch bevor die *Trias* von Vater, Sohn und Geist ist, ist der Logos als solcher im Vater; Logos und Vater sind demzufolge, bevor die *Monas* sich zur *Trias* erweitert hat.[59] Der Logos in Gott ist ewig.[60] Und Markell zieht zur Begründung dieser Auffassung wie bereits Asterius zuvor den Schriftvers Röm 1,20 heran: Der Logos ist der Logos »des unsichtbaren Gottes«. Logos, Weisheit und Kraft sind von Gott nicht zu trennen, sondern sind mit Gott ein- und dieselben.[61]

Markell bringt aber auch in der Lehre vom ewigen Logos, der Weisheit und Kraft, wichtige Korrekturen gegenüber Asterius an:

Im Unterschied zu Asterius, der offensichtlich den Logos, die Weisheit und die Kraft »des« Gottes weitgehend als Synonyme betrachtet, stellt Markell diese Begriffe nicht auf eine Stufe. Wie Th. Zahn richtig gesehen hat, ist die »Logoslehre (Markells) schon dadurch sofort in ihrer Eigenthümlichkeit erkennbar, daß ihm λόγος, σοφία und δύναμις nicht gleichwertige Bezeichnungen des Präexistenten sind«; für Markell ist der Begriff »Logos« die eigentliche Bezeichnung der göttlichen Kraft, nicht aber der Begriff »Kraft« die eigentliche Bezeichnung für den ewigen Logos[62].

Für Markell gibt es nur einen einzigen Logos, eine Weisheit und eine Kraft. Darum läßt Markell nicht nur die von Asterius angebrachte Unterscheidung in der Gottesprädikation fallen, sondern streicht überhaupt die Lehre von der Abbildhaftigkeit göttlicher Fähigkeiten. Gott schafft nicht durch Abbilden seiner Fähigkeiten, sondern durch wirkendes Hervorgehen des ewigen Logos. Der Logos ist Gottes Vermögen, das in seiner Vernunft liegt. Gott plant zusammen mit ihm, schaut und gestaltet in seinem eigenen Innern gemeinsam mit dem Logos die gedanklich vom Logos im Innern Gottes bereiteten Vorbilder, bevor er das sichtbare Werk auszuführen beginnt.[63] Sichtbar wird nicht der Gottes Tätigkeit begleitende Logos und die mit dem Logos seiende Weisheit, sondern die von diesem mitgestalteten Urtypen in ihrer sinnlich wahrnehmbaren, ausgeführten und geschaffenen Gestalt.[64]

Nicht einmal in der Inkarnation wird der Logos sinnlich wahrnehmbar, sondern er ist nur gedanklich zu ergreifen; sichtbar für die Sinne ist nur das angenommene Fleisch.[65]

Dennoch hält Markell daran fest, daß Gott vermittels des Logos dynamisch, schöpferisch, offenbarend und rettend ist. Abzulehnen ist das sabellianische Konzept, daß man »weder ›den‹ Gott genau kennt, noch seinen heiligen Logos. Wer nämlich den Logos nicht erkannt hat,

hat auch den Vater nicht erkannt«.[66] Gotteserkenntnis kann aber nur über die Vernunft geschehen, da das sichtbare Werk nicht wahres Abbild des unsichtbaren Gottes ist, sondern nur das Fleisch, das vom Logos angenommen wurde. Die sinnlich wahrnehmenden Augen vermögen nicht, Geistiges zu schauen, dies kann nur die Vernunft, indem sie das wirkende Hervortreten des Logos bei der Schöpfung und in der Annahme des menschlichen Fleisches und die Existenz des Vaters und seines Logos erkennt.[67]

Markell widerspricht Asterius, daß der Logos anläßlich von Schöpfung und Inkarnation außerhalb Gottes als ein anderer, zweiter Gott anzusetzen ist. Ein zweiter, anderer Gott, ein anderer Logos, eine andere Weisheit und eine andere Kraft widersprächen dem Axiom der Ausschließlichkeit und Einzigkeit Gottes: Zwischen Gott und dem Logos besteht keine Relation, sondern herrschen Einssein und Selbigkeit. Gott spricht »zu sich selbst *wie* zu einem anderen« und nicht zu einem *anderen*.[68] Die schöpferische Tätigkeit Gottes macht nicht die Erschaffung eines anderen Vermittlers notwendig. Im Gegenteil, der Logos Gottes ist so mit Gott eins wie der Logos des Menschen mit dem Menschen. Markell schreibt: »Gott, der Herr aller Dinge, richtet, da er das beseelte Standbild aus Erde macht, die Aufforderung nicht an einen anderen, sondern an seinen eigenen Logos, wenn er sagt: ›Wir wollen den Menschen machen‹ ...«.[69] Und an anderer Stelle sagt er: »Alles, was der Vater sagt, das sagt er offenbar überall durch seinen Logos; das wird auch von uns selbst her deutlich ..: Auch wir vollbringen ja alles, was wir ... sagen und tun wollen, durch unseren Logos«.[70] Und wie es nicht möglich ist, »den Logos des Menschen in der *Dynamis* und *Hypostase* zu trennen, vielmehr der Logos mit dem Menschen ein und dasselbe sei und sich lediglich im Wirken von ihm absondere, so auch sei der Logos mit Gott ein und dasselbe, so daß folgerichtig eine wirklich ungeteilte *Monas* existiere«.[71] Gott schafft durch denselben Logos, durch den er Fleisch annimmt und durch den er erlöst; Gott und Logos sind eine einzige *Hypostase*, ein einziges *Prosopon*; der Logos ist immer in Gott und im Logos ist Gott.

Anstelle der asterianischen hypostatischen Unterscheidung zweier Logoi, Weisheiten, Kräfte und Götter setzt Markell eine nichthypostatische Differenz innerhalb des einen Logos:

Als Vermögen-Sein ist der Logos immer in Gott (δυνάμει εἶναι), doch als Gott den Kosmos erschaffen wollte, trat der Logos als Wirken-Sein (ἐνεργείᾳ εἶναι) tätig, das heißt in seinem Wirken (ἐνεργείᾳ), hervor und

Gott gegenüber, blieb aber als Kraft und Vermögen in Gott, ist er doch der untrennbare Logos des Vaters.[72]

Weil der schöpferische, der vermittelnde und der vermittelte Logos entgegen der Vorstellung des Asterius ein und derselbe ist, kann Markell den Vater einen einzigen Ursprung (ἀρχή) nennen und die Schöpfung vermittels des Logos hervorgehen und retten lassen. Denn — und hier stimmen Markell und Asterius wieder überein — der Logos ist es, durch den der Vater tätig wird. Das Einssein von Logos und Gott vorausgesetzt, kann Markell deshalb auch den Logos als Schöpfer (ποιητής) bezeichnen.[73] Die Kritik des Markell an Asterius entspricht dem Vorwurf gegen Asterius und Eusebius von Caesarea, der in Ps.-Anthimus (Markell?), *De sancta ecclesia* vorgetragen wird; sie lehrten aufgrund der hypostatischen Trennung des aus dem Willen Gottes entstandenen Logos einen zweiten Ursprung und einen zweiten Anfang.[74]

c) Ein *Prosopon* von Vater und Logos:

Markell sieht im asterianischen Glaubensbekenntnis »an den Vater, Gott, den Allmächtigen (cf. Apk 11, 17), und an seinen Sohn, den μονογενὴς θεός (cf. Joh 1, 18), unseren Herrn Jesus Christus, und an den Heiligen Geist«[75] das gemeinsame Fundament mit seinem Gegner Asterius.[76] Er betont diese Gemeinsamkeit: »Uns allen ist diese Weise der Gottesverehrung nämlich gemeinsam, an den Vater und Sohn und Heiligen Geist zu glauben«.[77] Seine Einwände und Kritik an Asterius zielen nicht gegen die zitierte Bekenntnisformel seines Gegners, sondern gegen die asterianische Technik der Auslegung und Deutung, nach welcher »der Vater ... wahrhaft Vater [sei] und der Sohn wahrhaft Sohn und der Heilige Geist ebenso«.[78]

Die Unterscheidung von Vater und Sohn veranschaulichte Asterius mit dem anthropologischen Beispiel eines menschlichen Vaters, der einen Sohn zeugt. Vor der Zeugung ist der Sohn nicht, nach der Zeugung existiert er und er ist als Gezeugter bzw. Gewordener gegenüber seinem Zeuger, dem Ungewordenen, eine andere Person und eine zweite Hypostase. Entsprechend betonte das »wahrhafte« Vatersein und das »wahrhafte« Sohnsein für Asterius die Verschiedenheit der Personen und Hypostasen von Vater und Sohn (cf. Asterius, *frg.* 52-56 (25/B.; 27/B.; 28/B.; 30/B.); 60-62 (20c/B.; 29/B.)). Markell fragt kritisch: »Wer nun, meint Asterius, sei der, der sagt: ›Ich bin der Seiende‹ (Ex 3, 14), der Sohn oder der Vater? Er [Asterius] sagte nämlich, es gäbe

zwei *Hypostasen*, die von Vater und Sohn, mit Blick auf das menschliche Fleisch, das der Logos »des« Gottes annahm, und seinetwegen [des Fleisches wegen] erdachte er solches und trennte so den Sohn »des« Gottes vom Vater, wie man auch einen Sohn eines Menschen von seinem natürlichen Vater trennen könnte«.[79] Dagegen hält Markell an einer einzigen *Hypostase* von Vater und Logos fest. Er wendet sich gegen Asterius' Interpretation von 1 Kor 1, 24; Joh 10, 30; Joh 10, 38; Joh 14, 10 und Joh 14, 24:[80] »Es ist offenbar, daß natürlich auch jener [der Logos] sagte, ›In mir der Vater wie auch ich im Vater‹ (Joh. 10, 38), damit zwar der Logos, der dies sagt, in Gott ist, im Logos aber der Vater ist, weil der Logos eine Kraft des Vaters ist. ›Gottes‹ nämlich ist er ›Kraft und Gottes Weisheit‹, hat ein glaubwürdiger Zeuge gesagt«.[81] Anstelle der asterianischen Unterscheidung zweier Kräfte und Weisheiten in der Auslegung von 1 Kor 1,24 und Röm 1,20 behauptet Markell die Identität des einen Logos in Gott mit dem Logos, der redet und von dem in 1 Kor 1, 24 und Joh 10, 38 die Rede ist.[82] In verschiedenen Anläufen versucht Markell darzulegen, daß zwischen Vater und Sohn keine Harmonie (συμφωνία) besteht, sondern Einssein (ἑνότης).

Asterius hatte zwischen dem ewigen Logos und dem gezeugten bzw. gewordenen Logos unterschieden, nicht aber zwischen dem gewordenen Logos und dem herabgekommenen Logos, der aus Maria Mensch geworden ist (cf. Asterius, *frg.* 57f. (26/B.)). Dieser bereits vorkosmisch gezeugte Logossohn, der Christus, besitzt nach Asterius keine Namen, die ihm nicht vom Vater gegeben worden wären. Er ist Mensch und heißt als hypostatisch vom Vater getrennter Logossohn nur uneigentlich Logos, Weg, Tür usw. (cf. Asterius, *frg.* 69; 71). Markell greift diese asterianische Argumentation auf, kehrt sie aber um und kontert: Die eigentliche Bezeichnung des mit Gott ewig zusammen Existierenden *und* in Maria das menschliche Fleisch Annehmenden ist »Logos«. Erst vom Zeitpunkt der Inkarnation an erhält der Logos neue Namen, nämlich z.B. Christus, Jesus, Leben, Weg, Tag, Auferstehung, Tür usw.[83] Damit unterscheidet Markell zwischen Logos und Christus und zwischen Logos und dem angenommenen Fleisch/Mensch.

Für Markell ist wie für Asterius der Logos und die Kraft »des« Gottes das Subjekt der menschlichen Ökonomie und Erlösung. Asterius zufolge bedient sich die göttliche Kraft allerdings der ersten vorkosmisch gezeugten kreatürlichen Kraft, Markell zufolge ist es der einzige und ewige Logos, der menschliches Fleisch annimmt und auf diese Weise erlösend wirkt, damit nicht das Menschliche erlösend gedacht

wird. Beide hätten sich in diesem Punkt eigentlich verstehen können und liegen gar nicht weit in ihren Positionen auseinander. Nur dem Grundsatz, daß »der« Gott durch einen Gleichen Gleiches schafft, konnte Markell nicht folgen. Auf einen Menschen, meint Markell, kann man seine Hoffnung nicht gründen, sondern nur auf den das Schwache annehmenden göttlichen Logos. Welche Funktion aber das Fleisch hat, das der Logos angenommen hat, gibt Markell ein Rätsel auf, das er nach Auskunft seiner Fragment letztlich nicht löst: Einerseits liest Markell in der Schrift, daß das Fleisch nichts nützt, andererseits nennt er es auch ein göttliches Fleisch.[84]

So klar die Antwort des Markell auf den asterianischen Gottesbegriff zu sein scheint, so undeutlich bleibt sein Sohnbegriff und so offen bleibt sein Lösungsversuch, was die Schlußfolgerungen bezüglich des Inkarnierten betrifft. Kein Wunder, daß die meisten Gegner Markells ihn in diesen offenen Fragen zu widerlegen begannen. Wer aber den asterianischen Hintergrund mitlas und erkannte, daß das Konzept des Markell auf der in Teilen mit Asterius gemeinsamen Grundlage des Gottes- und Logos-, Weisheits- und Kraftbegriffes ruhte, der mußte bei der Aporetisierung dieser Ausgangspositionen ansetzen.

NOTES

[1] Der Artikel ist die Übersetzung eines ausgearbeiteten und gekürzten Vortrags am Patristischen Seminar der Universität Cambridge/England vom 9.3.1992 mit dem Titel: Defining the undefinable. The divine essence in the debate between Asterius of Cappadocia, Marcellus of Ancyra and Pseudo-Athanasius, *Contra Arianos IV.*

[2] Cf. *lib. syn. ad synod. Antioch. anno 341* (Mansi II, col. 1350); A.M. Ritter, Arius redivivus: *ZKG* 89 (1990) 153-187, 168 setzt die Lebensdaten von Asterius auf ca. 270-345; cf. M. Vinzent, *Asterius von Kappadokien, Theologische Fragmente. Einleitung, kritischer Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar,* Diss. masch., München 1991 (wird veröffentlicht in den *Suppl. to VigChr*, Leiden), 18-28.

[3] G. Bardy, Astérius le Sophiste: *RHE 22* (1926) 221-272; ders., *Recherches sur Saint Lucien d'Antioche et son école*, Paris 1936, 316-354.

[4] Cf. M. Richard, *Opera minora i*, ed. E. Dekkers u. a., Turnhout/Leuven 1976, 11.

[5] Cf. *Asterii sophistae commentariorum in Psalmos quae supersunt accedunt aliquot homiliae anonymae,* ed. M. Richard *(Symbolae Osloenses, fasc. suppl. 16),* Oslo 1956.

[6] Cf. W. Kinzig, *In Search of Asterius. Studies on the Authorship of the Homilies on the Psalms* (Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte; Bd. 47), Göttingen 1990, 32.

[7] Cf. R.C. Gregg/D.E. Groh, The Centrality of Soteriology in Early Arianism: *Anglican Theological Review* 59 (1977) 260-278; R.C. Gregg/D.E. Groh, *Early Arianism — A View*

of Salvation, London 1981; M.F. Wiles/R.C. Gregg, Asterius: A new chapter in the history of Arianism? in: *Arianism*, 111-151 (cf. Anm. 8).

[8] *Arianism. Historical and theological reassessments. Papers from the Ninth International Conference on Patristic Studies, Oxford 1983*, ed. R.C. Gregg (Patristic Monograph Series 11), Cambridge 1985.

[9] R.C. Gregg/D.E. Groh, *Early Arianism* (cf. Anm. 7), X.

[10] Cf. G.C. Stead, Rez. zu *Arianism*, ed. R.C. Gregg (Cambridge 1985): *JThS N.S.* 38 (1987) 199-205, 203; R. Williams, *Arius. Heresy and Tradition*, London 1987, 321[17]; die Kritik Steads läßt sich wohl auch aus dem Titel und dem Inhalt seines *curiosum* herauslesen: G.C. Stead, The Arian Controversy: A New Perspective, in EPMHNEYMATA, FS Hadwig Hörner, ed. H. Eisenberger, Heidelberg 1990, 51-59; cf. L. Abramowski, Die dritte Arianerrede des Athanasius. Eusebianer und Arianer und das westliche Serdicense: *ZKG* 102 (1991) 389-413, Abramowski diskutiert Asterius, ohne auf die *Psalmenhomilien* einzugehen.

[11] Cf. W. Kinzig, *In Search of Asterius* (cf. Anm. 6), 157; cf. ders., *Erbin Kirche. Die Auslegung von Psalm 5,1 in den Psalmenhomilien des Asterius und der Alten Kirche* (Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Kl., Jg. 1990, 2), Heidelberg 1990.

[12] K.-H. Uthemann, Rez. zu Wolfram Kinzig, *In Search of Asterius* (Göttingen 1990): *VigChr* 45 (1991) 194-203, 203.

[13] Cf. W. Kinzig, Asterius Sophista oder Asterius Ignotus? Eine Antwort: *VigChr* 45 (1991) 388-398.

[14] Diese These prüfe ich gegenwärtig bei meiner Beschäftigung mit zu Ps.-Ath., *contra Arianos IV*; da Bardys Ausgabe des Asterius unkritisch und — wie sich bei einer Überprüfung ergab — unvollständig ist, erscheint demnächst eine neue Ausgabe der theologischen Fragmente des Asterius (cf. meine Dissertation, Anm. 2), auf die ich in diesem Artikel bereits zurückgreife; die Argumentation im vorliegenden Artikel basiert aber weitgehend auf den bereits bei Bardy Asterius zugeschriebenen Fragmenten; die Zählung Bardys wird beim Verweis auf die Fragmente jeweils in Parenthesen beigegeben.

[15] Zum folgenden cf. meine in Anm. 2 genannte Dissertation, Einleitung, Kap. II.

[16] Cf. das Werk Markells gegen Asterius und andere Eusebianer, dessen Fragmente aufbewahrt sind bei Euseb. Caes., *contra Marcellum* und *de ecclesiastica theologia*; herausgegeben sind sie zusammen mit Markells *Brief an Julius von Rom* in: Eusebius von Caesarea, *Werke*, 4. Bd., ed. E. Klostermann (=GCS), Leipzig 1906; 2. Aufl., durchgesehen von G. Chr. Hansen, Berlin 1972, 183-215; cf. Hier., *de vir. inl.* 86 (44, 17-25 R), wonach Asterius gegen Markell geschrieben habe; diese Notiz läßt sich aus den erhaltenen Fragmenten zwar nicht verifizieren, und ebenso läßt sich aus ihr kein zeitlicher Anhalt für eine antimarkellische Invektive finden, eine Entscheidung über ihren historischen Wert läßt sich aber erst fällen lassen, wenn die im selben Zusammenhang von Hieronymus erwähnte Nachricht, auch Apolinarius habe gegen Markell geschrieben und ihn des Sabellianisierens bezichtigt, überprüft ist.

[17] Cf. W. Kinzig, *In Search of Asterius* (cf. Anm. 6), 17.

[18] Cf. Ath., *de syn.* 20, 1 (247, 3f. Op.); ders., *c. Ar. I* 30. 32 (PG 26, 76 A. 77 A); ebd. *III* 2. 60 (324 C. 449 B); cf. Markell, *frg.* 35 (190, 24f. Kl.).

[19] Cf. Ath., *de decr. Nic. syn.* 8, 1; 20, 2 (7, 20; 17, 3-5 Op.).

[20] Cf. Ath., *de syn.* 18, 2 (245, 21-23 Op.); Epiph., *Panarion, haer.* 76, 3 (343, 23f. H.); Socr., *hist. eccl. I* 36 (PG 67, 172 B); Philost., *hist. eccl. II* 14 (25, 15-18 B./W.).

[21] Cf. Philost., *hist. eccl. II* 14 (25, 16-18 B./W.).

[22] Cf. Asterius, *frg.* 5-7 (17-19/B.).

[23] Cf. Ath., *de syn.* 18,3 (245, 29-31 Op.); Socr., *hist. eccl. I* 36 (172 B).

[24] Zu der Datierung cf. R.M. Hübner, *Die Schrift des Apolinarius von Laodicea gegen Photin (Pseudo-Athanasius, Contra Sabellianos) und Basilius von Caesarea* (Patristische Texte und Studien 30), Berlin/New York 1989, 129.

[25] Cf. Eusebius von Caesarea, *Werke*, 4. Bd., *Gegen Marcell. Über die kirchliche Theologie. Die Fragmente Markells*, ed. E. Klostermann, durchgesehen von G. Chr. Hansen (=GCS), Berlin 1972.

[26] Das Credo ist überliefert: Ath., *de syn.* 23, 2-7 (249, 11-33 Op.).

[27] Cf. Acacius von Caesarea, *c. Marcellum*, in: Epiph. Sal., *Panarion, haer.* 72, 6-10, ed. K. Holl (=GCS), Leipzig 1933, 260-264.

[28] Markell, *ep. ad Iul.* (= *ibid., frg.* 129; 214f. Kl.); vgl. meine Dissertation, Einleitung, Kap. II (cf. Anm. 2).

[29] Cf. das westliche *Serdicense* in: M. Tetz, Ante omnia de sancta fide et de integritate veritatis. Glaubensfragen auf der Synode von Serdika (342): *ZNW* 76 (1985) 243-269, 250-258; cf. L. Abramowski, Die dritte Arianerrede (cf. Anm. 10); zu diesem Artikel und zur Diskussion der antiasterianischen Passagen des *Serdicense* cf. meine Dissertation, Einleitung, Kap. II (cf. Anm. 2).

[30] Cf. L. Abramowski, Die dritte Arianerrede (cf. Anm. 10), 389, Abramowski argumentiert gegen die Datierung von *c. Ar. I-III* bei M. Tetz (*Oratio I-II* 340/341?, *Oratio III* 345/346?), akzeptiert aber die Nähe von *c. Ar. III* zum *Serdicense* (342).

[31] In: G. Mercati, *Note di letteratura biblica e cristiana antiqua* (SeT 5), Rom 1905, 95-98, 97, 52. 64; cf. meine Dissertation, Einleitung, Kap. II (cf. Anm. 2).

[32] Cf. G. Feige, *Die Lehre Markells von Ankyra in der Darstellung seiner Gegner* (Erfurter Theologische Studien 58), Erfurt 1991, 172f.

[33] Cf. meine Dissertation, Einleitung, Kap. IV und ebd. den Exkurs im Kommentar zu Frg. 63 (cf. Anm. 2).

[34] Hierzu und zum gesamten zweiten Teil cf. meine Dissertation, Einleitung, Kapitel IV (cf. Anm. 2).

[35] Cf. Asterius, *frg.* 5 (18/B.); zur theologiegeschichtlichen Einordnung des Asterius cf. meine Dissertation, Einleitung, Kap. IV (cf. Anm. 2).

[36] Cf. dazu weiter unten.

[37] Cf. Th. Zahn, *Marcellus von Ancyra*, Gotha 1867, 40: »Er hatte darzuthun gesucht, daß das frei gewollte Setzen anderen Daseins ein Gottes würdigeres Verhalten sei als das physische, eigentlich gemeinte Zeugen«.

[38] Cf. Arius, *ep. ad Alex. Alex.* 2; 4 (=Ur. 6; 12, 4; 13, 12 Op.); ders, *Thalia*, in: Ath., *de syn.* 15 (243, 1 Op.); es ist wohl kein Zufall, daß Asterius hingegen die Zahlbegriffe in seinem Credo vor Vater und Sohn ausläßt.

[39] Cf. Arius, *Thalia*, in: Ath., *de syn.* (242, 10. 24 Op.).

[40] Dies gilt aufgrund der relationslosen Absolutheit umgekehrt *nicht* für den Ungewordenen und Ewigen. Diese Unumkehrbarkeit in der Herleitung der Definition ist ein markanter Unterschied zum weniger spekulativen Ansatz des Arius, cf. Arius, *Thalia*, in: Ath., *de syn.* 15 (242, 11-13 Op.); vgl. hierzu den Vergleich Asterius — Arius in meiner Diss., Einleitung, Kapitel IV (cf. Anm. 2).

[41] Cf. jüngstens G. Feige, *Die Lehre Markells* (cf. Anm. 32), mit ebd. 1-12 einem Forschungsüberblick; bei Feige wird an den wenigen Stellen, an denen Asterius erwähnt wird,

die theologische Auseinandersetzung Markells mit seinem Hauptgegner nirgends entfaltet; im Quellenverzeichnis (ebd. 250) fehlt deshalb jede Bezugnahme auf die Fragmente des Asterius.

[42] Cf. den Forschungsüberblick bei R.M. Hübner, *Die Schrift des Apolinarius* (cf. Anm. 24), nachzutragen ist die Kritik an der Zuschreibung von (Anthimus Nicomedensis), *de sancta ecclesia* (cf. Anm. 31), an Markell durch R.P.C. Hanson, The date and the authorship of Pseudo-Anthimus, de sancta ecclesia: *PIA*, Section C (1983) 351-354; zu Hanson äußerte sich jedoch kritisch A.H.B. Logan, Marcellus of Ancyra and anti-Arian Polemic: *Studia Patristica* 19 (Leuven 1989) 189-197.

[43] Vgl. Markell, *frg.* 28; 65 (189, 16-18; 197, 9f. Kl.).

[44] Inwieweit diese Übernahmen ungewollt, vielleicht gar von der theologischen und politischen Lage der Zeit erzwungen war, müßte unter Berücksichtigung seiner *Epistel ad Iulium* eigens untersucht werden.

[45] Cf. G. Frige, *Die Lehre Markells* (cf. Anm. 32), 191f.

[46] Cf. Asterius, *frg.* 2 (7/B.).

[47] Cf. Asterius, *frg.* 21f.; Markell, *frg.* 103 (207, 26-28 Kl.).

[48] Markell, *frg.* 103 (207, 27-31 Kl.).

[49] Markell, *frg.* 103 (207, 32f. Kl.).

[50] Cf. R.M. Hübner, *Die Schrift des Apolinarius* (cf. Anm. 24), 131: »Alle Autoren sind sich darüber einig, daß die Wahrung des strengen Monotheismus das erste Anliegen Markells ist«.

[51] Cf. Markell, *frg.* 61; 75-78 (196; 200-202 Kl.); cf. hierzu: R.M. Hübner, *Die Schrift des Apolinarius* (cf. Anm. 24), 131.

[52] Cf. Markell, *frg.* 66f.; 71; 76-78 (197-201 Kl.).

[53] Markell, *frg.* 58 (195, 13-15 Kl.).

[54] Markell, *frg.* 61 (196, 17-19 Kl.).

[55] Cf. das Zitat von Jes 45, 21 in Markell, *frg.* 76 (200, 24f. Kl.).

[56] Cf. Markell, *frg.* 103 (207, 26-32 Kl.); cf. auch ders., *frg.* 52; 76; 100 (194, 10-16; 200, 33-201, 2; 206f. Kl.).

[57] Cf. Markell, *frg.* 76; 104; 121; 129 = *ep. ad Iul.* (201, 7f. 19; 208, 3; 212, 5. 10; 215, 4 Kl.).

[58] Markell, *frg.* 60 (196, 11f. Kl.).

[59] Cf. Markell, *frg.* 52, 60, 67 (194, 10f.; 196,3; 197, 32-198, 2f. Kl.).

[60] Cf. Markell, *frg.* 51; 53 (194, 5-9; 17-21 Kl.).

[61] Cf. Markell, *frg.* 110 (208, 27f. Kl.); vgl. Asterius, frg. 64 (1/8).

[62] Cf. Markell, *frg.* 42f. (192 Kl.), Selbigkeit bedeutet nicht absolute Identität, cf. Th. Zahn, *Marcellus* (cf. Anm. 37), 120.

[63] Cf. Markell, *frg.* 58f. (195, 129-31 Kl.).

[64] Cf. Markell, *frg.* 58 (195, 24f. Kl.).

[65] Cf. Markell, *frg.* 93 (205, 8f. Kl.).

[66] Markell, *frg.* 44 (192, 28-30 Kl.).

[67] Markell, *frg.* 92 (205,3 Kl.); cf. ders., *frg* 74 (200, 10-14 kl.).

[68] Markell, *frg.* 58 (195, 24 Kl.).

[69] Markell, *frg.* 58 (195, 25-27 Kl.); cf. R. M. Hübner, *Die Schrift des Apolinarius* (cf. Anm. 24), 132f.

[70] Markell, *frg.* 62 (196, 24-27 Kl.); cf. zu Übersetzung und Inhalt R. M. Hübner, *Die Schrift des Apolinarius* (cf. Anm. 24), 133.

[71] R. M. Hübner, *Die Schrift des Apolinarius* (cf. Anm. 24), 133, eine Paraphrase von Markell, *frg.* 61; 71 (196, 20-22; 198, 21f. K1.).

[72] Cf. Markell, *frg.* 52; 60; 121 (194, 10-16; 196, 3-5; 212, 10-12 K1.).

[73] Cf. Markell, *frg.* 60 (196, 5-8 K1.).

[74] Cf. Ps.-Anthimus, *de sancta ecclesia*, 14-17 (98, 76-90 M.); dieser Vorwurf darf nicht mit dem ähnlich lautenden Vorwurf der Zweiursächlichkeit verwechselt werden, der in Ps.-Ath., *c. Ar. IV* 1-12 erhoben wird und auf Gott und seinen »innergöttlichen« Logos zu beziehen ist.

[75] Markell, *frg.* 65 (192, 9-16 K1.); cf. Asterius, *frg.* 9 (20ab/B.).

[76] Cf. Markell, *frg.* 65 (197, 9-16 K1.).

[77] Markell, *frg.* 65 (197, 14-16 K1.).

[78] Asterius, *frg.* 60 (20c/B.); cf. Markell, *frg.* 65 (197, 16-22 K1.).

[79] Markell, *frg.* 63 (196,28-197,2 K1.); cf. Asterius, *frg.* 52 (27/B); 75.

[80] Cf. zu 1 Kor 1, 24 Asterius, *frg.* 64 (1/B.); 67f. (26/B.); zu Joh 10, 30; Joh 10, 38; Joh 14, 10 Asterius, *frg.* 38f. (13/B.; 32/b.); 41f.; 49 (24/B.); zu Joh 14, 24 Asterius, *frg.* 38 (13/B.).

[81] Markell, *frg.* 73 (198, 29-32 K1.).

[82] Cf. Markell, *frg.* 73 (198f. K1.).

[83] Cf. Markell, *frg.* 73f. (198-200 K1.). Wie die Bezeichnung "Sohn" nach Markell einzuordnen ist, ist ein in der Forschung umstrittenes und bisher nicht gelöstes Problem, cf. R. M. Hübner, *Die Schrift des Apolinarius*, 139 mit ebd.[60] (cf. Anm. 24).

[84] Cf. Markell, *frg.* 121 (212, 3f. K1.); cf. auch ders., *frg.* 116f. (209-211 K1.).

8000 *München* 19, Menzinger Str. 6

Vigiliae Christianae 47 (1993), 192-208, E. J. Brill, Leiden

REVIEWS

B. R. Rees, *The Letters of Pelagius and his Followers.* Woodbridge, The Boydell Press, 1991. VII, 355 p.

"Christian life...is concerned above all with obedience to the divine law and the performance of good works": this phrase on p. 9 of the book under review seems a fair summary of the primary objective of the Pelagian 'movement'. Its founding father "was above all a moral reformer who became involved in a theological controversy" (2). Such lucid statements are characteristic of the first part of Prof. Rees' introduction, which summarizes the findings set out in his *Pelagius. A Reluctant Heretic* (Woodbridge 1988, see this journal 45, 1991, 87-89). During the preparations of that study R. discovered that only a small part of the Pelagian corpus was available in an English translation. He decided to fill up this gap, a decision which entailed a stiff task indeed. Although, generally speaking, the Latin of the texts in question is quite clear in contrast to e.g. the intricate and difficult language of the Priscillianist collection, it nevertheless requires both skill and persistence to render so many pages in attractive and readable English.

The translation can be judged successful, which does not imply the absence of any causes for criticism. Here and there a few words are omitted or less satisfactorily rendered. The instances in which R. has definitely gone astray are quite scarce. A few examples: "he is not a servant of Christ but a mocker and a skoffer who claims that he is the servant of one whom he merely pretends to serve" (108, *On the Christian Life* 1.2); the last relative clause is certainly not the equivalent of *cui seruire dissimulat* (PL 50, 385), where *dissimulare* means 'to neglect' or 'to refuse' (cf. Aug. *Conf.* 5.10.19). In Pelagius' *Letter to Celantia* 30.2 the author chides his addressee for her decision to practise sexual abstinence without having discussed this with her husband, *de cuius conscientia non diffidimus, si paululum expectasses* (CSEL LVI, 354.21-22); R. renders this by "...we do not lack confidence, if you had expected us to have only a little", but the conditional clause simply means 'if you had waited for a short while' (i.e. 'if you only had had a little patience'). Right at the end of this same letter the author quotes from Ps. 42 (43).4, i.a. *ad deum, qui laetificat iuuentutem meam*: R.

translates: "to God of my exceeding joy'. This renders the original Hebrew more correctly, but it is not a translation of the Latin, which is also the version of the Vulgate. This is of course a more general problem. Should one render a Latin quotation from Scripture in whichever version 'literally', even if the result is unfamiliar or incomprehensible to a modern reader, or substitute it by an authorized translation of the original?

One of the most interesting and illustrative writings in the collection is the *Tractatus de diuitiis*, edited by C. P. Caspari in his *Briefe, Abhandlungen und Predigten*, Christiania 1890, 25-67. In introducing his translation of this tract (171-174), R. is in particularly good form, witness some excellent characterizations like: "...an impressive, comprehensive and powerful denunciation of riches as a stumbling-block to all who wish to attain Christian perfection", which was the ideal, or rather the earnest aim, of the Pelagianists. R. also refers quite aptly to the writer's "skill in marshalling his arguments" and his rhetorical accomplishments in general. The translation matches the lively language of the original, although in this case too some omissions and errors can be detected. A slight one occurs near the end of ch. 11, where the author discusses John's taking Jesus' mother under his care: *suscepit illam discipulus ille in sua* (Ioh. 19.27). The words *in sua* cannot mean *in sua bona*, for John had abandoned all his 'riches'. They rather mean *ut matrem*. In fact that was the implication of the Lord's command: *ut eius uita filii solatio foueretur*. R. renders: "so that she might be supported and conforted by him in place of her son". It should be 'by a son'.

More complicated is the argument in the second half of ch. 12, where R. seems to have missed one or two points. One example. In the Church the catechumens and the baptized form two different groups. Yet "both are pressing on to the same end". Then the author continues: *Nec idcirco omnes aut non poterant aut non debebant ad eundem populum peruenire, quia inter initia duos esse manifestum est.* R. renders this by: "for they either cannot or ought not to belong to the same class for the reason that it is quite clear that there were two classes from the beginning". By neglecting *nec* he seems to arrive at the direct opposite of the text's intention. The author explains that the reason for the fact that not all either could or should belong to the same class does not consist in the mere presence of two classes in the initial stage.

Ch. 19 provides a case in which the rendering of a biblical quotation

is definitely faulty. The author quotes Sir. 18.19 *Ante iudicium para iustitiam.* R. renders by: "Before judgement, examine yourself". This, however, is Sir. 18.20 (*et ante iudicium interroga teipsum*). These examples merely show that in this large project too at times *bonus dormitat Homerus.* Prof. Rees should be congratulated for providing this most useful supplement to his study of Pelagius and his movement.

2353 BM *Leiderdorp*, van Effendreef 15 J. DEN BOEFT

J.H. Scourfield, *Consoling Heliodorus. A Commentary on Jerome Letter 60* (Oxford Classical Monographs), Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1993. 260 S. £35,—

Es gibt bis jetzt nur wenig ausführliche Kommentare zu den einzelnen Werken des Hieronymus. So darf der gründliche Kommentar, den Scourfield zum 60. Brief des Hieronymus, einem Trostbrief anlässlich des Todes des Presbyters Nepotianus, verfasst hat, mit seiner reichen Dokumentation und seinen zahlreichen Hinweisen auf Parallelstellen aus der ausgedehnten literarischen Nachlassenschaft dieses Kirchenvaters, als ein willkommener Gewinn gelten.

Als Trostbrief schliesst *Epistula* 60 in mancherlei Hinsicht an eine bestehende Tradition an. An manchem Beispiel lässt sich feststellen, inwieweit ein christlicher Autor heidnische Auffassungen ablehnt oder gegebenenfalls akzeptiert und verarbeitet.

Der gebotene Text ist der des Hilberg (CSEL), mit einigen kleinen Emendationen, die im Kommentar besprochen werden. Die englische Übersetzung ist klar und sorgfältig. Die Einführung der aus einer Oxforder Thesis hervorgegangenen Studie ist allgemeiner Art: sie enthält eine kurze Biographie des Hieronymus und eine Übersicht über die literarische Gattung der *consolatio.*

Der Kommentar bietet alles Notwendige zum richtigen Verstehen des Textes. Scourfield macht die Gliederung der *Epistula* und die Entwicklung des Gedankenganges deutlich. Die Wirkung der Tradition und der *praecepta rhetorum* ist klar ins Licht gerückt worden. Besonders nützlich und aufschlussreich sind die vielen Parallelstellen, namentlich aus den anderen Trostbriefen des Hieronymus, aber auch aus der Trostliteratur im allgemeinen.

So Vieles ein Kommentar auch bietet, man kann immer mehr verlangen. So wäre zu S. 133-134 eine Ergänzung möglich: neben den profanen Belegstellen (Seneca: *abstulit, sed dedit*; Libanius: ἔδωκεν, εἶτα ἀφείλετο) wäre auch eine biblische zu nennen (*Job* 1, 21: *Dominus dedit, Dominus abstulit*). Ebenso vermisst man einen Hinweis auf biblische Stellen zu 7,3 (S. 129), wo für *viscera* in der Bedeutung »eine teure Person« ausschliesslich Beispiele aus der profanen Literatur angeführt werden (vgl. *Ep. ad Philemonem* 12: *Tu autem eum, ut viscera mea, suscipe*; *ibid.* 20: *Refice viscera mea in Christo*). Zu 18,1 (S. 72 *modum excedere*) könnte man auf analoge Formulierungen in Hieronymus' Briefen hinweisen, wie *Ep.* 53,9 *Cernis me ... excessisse modum epistulae*; *Ep.* 69,8 *iam enim intellego me mensuram excedere epistulae*; *Ep.* 29,7 *quia et in hoc brevitatem excessimus.*

Es wäre sinnvoll gewesen zu *monasterium* (10,2, S. 148: "dwelling of a single monk") das früheste Vorkommen dieser Bedeutung des Terminus zu verzeichnen. Es findet sich nämlich, etwa zwei Jahrzehnte früher als die erwähnten Hieronymusstellen, mehrmals in Evagrius von Antiochiens Übersetzung der *Vita Antonii* des Athanasius (wahrscheinlich bereits vor 373; siehe L.Th.A. Lorié, *Spiritual Terminology in the Latin Translations of the Vita Antonii*, Lat. Christ. Primaeva 11, Utrecht-Nijmegen 1955, S. 46).

Zu 8,1, S. 136 (*avitis ... videatur*), wo auf eine Parallele bei Gregor von Nazianz (*Or.* 43,8; Lobrede auf Basilius) hingewiesen wird, ist hervorzuheben, dass Gregor hier offensichtlich auf Basilius selber zurückgreift, bei dem man ebenfalls in diesem Zusammenhang das Bild des Bergstromes findet (*Homilie auf den Märtyrer Mamas*, PG 31,592A: der heilige Mamas hat selbst die Fackel seines Ruhmes entzündet; andere gehen auf ihn zurück, nicht er auf andere; man vergleiche weiter Asterius von Amasea, *Hom.* 8,4 *Encomium Petri et Pauli*).

Vielleicht hat Hieronymus sich bei der Beschreibung des Todes des Nepotianus (13,2; S. 177) von der Schilderung des Todes des Antonius in der *Vita Antonii* (c. 92) beeinflussen lassen (*venientes-amicos-laetus vultus*).

Im Kommentar zum Thema des Konfliktes zwischen den Forderungen der *pietas* und des christlichen Glaubens (7,2; S. 128) werden zutreffende Parallelen aus Schriften des Ambrosius und des Paulinus von Nola angeführt; auch bei griechischen christlichen Schriftstellern finden sich derartige Äusserungen, z.B. bei Gregor von Nazianz: in den Grabgedichten und in seiner Korrespondenz über den Tod seines Bruders Caesarius.

In Scourfields reichhaltigem Kommentar ist besonders die vorzügliche Weise zu schätzen, in der er Hieronymus' Trostbrief im Rahmen der profanen und christlichen Trostliteratur behandelt hat.

6523 LH *Nijmegen*, Postweg 152 G.J.M. BARTELINK

Klaus Koschorke, *Spuren der alten Liebe. Studien zum Kirchenbegriff des Basilius von Caesarea* (Paradosis 32). Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz 1991.

Das Kirchenverständnis der griechischen Reichskirche im 4.Jhdt wird meistens mit einer Paraphrase der 18. Katechese des Kyrill von Jerusalem umschrieben: Die Kirche ist eine Gemeinschaft des Glaubens und der Tugend, die mit allen denkbaren hohen Prädikaten, oft den alttestamentlichen Aussagen über das Volk Israel entnommen, geschmückt wird. Das ist nach der Meinung der Autoren, die sich mit diesem Thema befasst haben, die allgemeine Idee, die man schon bei Origenes finden kann.

Der Verf. dieses Buches zeigt, dass aus Basilius' Schriften ein ganz anderer Kirchenbegriff hervor tritt. Bei ihm herrscht der Gedanke vor, die aktuelle Kirche sei nicht so, wie sie sein sollte. Um es mit den Worten des Verf. zu sagen: »Die Merkmale der Kirche kommen also v.a. im Modus des Defizits zur Sprache« (S. 16).

Die Hauptidee bei Basilius ist die Kirche als Leib Christi. Liebe und Frieden sind die Merkmale, an denen der Leib Christi erkannt werden kann (S. 17). Wenn Basilius an die Kirche denkt, wie sie sein sollte, dann drängt sich ihm das Bild der Urgemeinde auf. Es freut ihn sehr, wenn er in einem Brief, den er von einem Mitbischof empfangen hat, »die Spuren der alten Liebe« findet.

Nach Basilius' Meinung bedarf die Kirche einer Reform. Sein Reformprogramm zur Wiederaufrichtung der verwüsteten Kirche liegt in den *Moralia* vor. Der Verf. zeigt, wie alles, was Basilius unternahm, im Lichte seines Kirchenbegriffs zu verstehen ist. Das Mönchtum wurde von ihm bekanntlich sehr gefördert. Er meint jedoch, dass für die »Christen« in Kloster und grosser Gemeinde dieselben Masstäbe gelten (S. 50).

In einer Zeit, in der Katechumenen die Mehrheit der 'christlichen' Bevölkerung ausmachten, verteidigt er die These, dass erst durch die

Taufe ein Mensch des Titels »Christ« würdig wird (S. 137-8). Der Leib-Christi-Gedanke soll sich in den sozialen Strukturen der Kirche manifestieren. Die sozialen Aktivitäten des Basilius sind bekannt. In seinem Kampf gegen die Häretiker zeigt sich stets seine Überzeugung, dass die Ursache diese Übels im Verlust der alten Liebe, und deshalb der Einheit des Leibes Christi, liegt. Auch zeigt der Verf. wie wenig Basilius' Urteil über den Zustand der Kirche vom Wechsel der Kirchenpolitischen Konstellation (Konstantius, Julian, Jovian, Valens) bestimmt ist.

Im 5.Kapitel bespricht der Verf. die zentrale Bedeutung der Taufe für Denken und Kirchenverständnis des Basilius. Demgegenüber, so stellt er fest, fällt es auf, wie selten B. die Eucharistie erwähnt. In *Moralia* 21 entdeckt er sogar eine Polemik gegen ein sakramentalistisches Misverständnis der Eucharistie. Hier kann ich dem Verf. nicht mehr folgen. Es ist wahr, dass, nach Basilius, die Eucharistie geschieht »zur Erinnerung an den *Gehorsam* des Herrn bis zum Tode, damit die Lebenden nicht mehr sich selbst leben, sondern dem für sie Gestorbenen und Auferstandenen« (S. 117). So lautet tatsächlich die dritte These der *Moralia* 21. Aber die erste These lautet: »Auch die Teilnahme an Christi Leib und Blut ist notwendig für das ewige Leben«. Wenn der Verf. S. 141 sagt, dass die Heilsnotwendigkeit der Taufe von Basilius sehr betont wird, muss man m.E. hinzufügen, dass in *Moralia* 21 die Heilsnotwendigkeit der Eucharistie mit der der Taufe verglichen wird.

Schliesslich sei noch bemerkt, dass in der Übersetzung von *De Sancto Spiritu* X 26 (S. 108) eine Negation ausgefallen ist. Man soll dort lesen: »Wer diese Bekenntnis ... *nicht* bewahrt, ... der schliesst sich selbst von den Verheissungen Gottes aus«.

Der Verf. hat mit dieser sehr gut dokumentierten Abhandlung eine neue Sicht auf Basilius' Denken über die Kirche geboten, was ein nicht geringes Verdienst bedeutet.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106 J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

Grégoire de Nazianze, *Discours* 42-43. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Jean Bernardi (Sources Chrétiennes 384). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992. 324 p. 226 F.

Ce volume contient deux Discours, dont l'apparence diffère de ce qu'ils sont en réalité. Le *Discours* 42 se présente au lecteur comme celui que Grégoire, évêque de Constantinople et président du deuxième con-

cile oecuménique, aurait prononcé devant le concile pour lui présenter sa démission du siège épiscopal. L'éditeur pense que Grégoire a composé ce discours d'adieu, plein de critique sur l'épiscopat contemporain, plus tard en plusieurs étapes et qu'il n'avait pas encore achevé l'oeuvre, quand la mort le surprit en 390.

Le Discours 43 se présente comme l'oraison funèbre que Grégoire a consacré à son ami, Basile, à l'occasion de la célébration de sa mémoire. Mais le texte est trop long et trop élaboré pour avoir été imposé tel quel à ses auditeurs. «Il y a donc tout lieu de penser que le texte parvenu entre nos mains résulte d'un large remaniement opéré par l'auteur au cours des dernières années de son existence dans la solitude d'Arianze». (p. 28). L'introduction succincte aide vraiment à une lecture profitable de ces discours difficiles.

Le texte grec est impeccable, la traduction claire et précise, les notes sont très utiles. L'éditeur a rendu un grand service à ceux qui veulent étudier ces oeuvres très importantes.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106 J. C. M. VAN WINDEN

Johannes Chrysostomus, *Catecheses baptismales/Taufkatechesen*. Griechisch, Deutsch. 2 Bände. Übersetzt und eingeleitet von Reiner Kaczinski (Fontes Christiani 6/1-2). Freiburg usw., Herder, 1992. 520 S. DM 46.00 + 39.00

Von den acht Taufkatechesen, die in dieser zweisprachigen Ausgabe geboten werden, finden sich zwei bei Migne (die Nummer 1 und 2/1). Die übrigen wurden erst in diesem Jahrhundert entdeckt. Der Verf. kann mit Recht sagen: »Kein Teil des Gesamtwerkes des Johannes Chrysostomus hat der Wissenschaft im Laufe des 20.Jahrhunderts so viele Überraschungen gebracht wie seine Taufkatechesen« (S. 30).

Die Nummerierung der Predigten (1; 2/1-4; 3/1-7) deutet die Einteilung an. Zunächst gibt es eine einzige Predigt, die zu den sogen. »Säulenhomilien« gehört, dann die vier von A. Papadopoulos Kerameus herausgegebenen Taufkatechesen (1909) und schließlich sieben der acht von A. Wenger 1955 entdeckten Katechesen (eine dieser acht ist in der Reihe der vier aufgenommen und gehört auch dazu). Wenger gab die acht von ihm entdeckten Predigten in den 'Sources Chrétiennes' 50 (1957) heraus; diese Ausgabe enthielt also auch eine der vier von Papadopoulos

entdeckten Katechesen. Die drei übrigen wurden 1990 von Piédagnel in den 'Sources Chrétiennes' 360 herausgegeben.

In der Einleitung bietet der Verf., neben eine Schilderung der Überlieferung und Abfassungszeit der Taufkatechesen, eine klare Übersicht des Lebens und Werkes des Johannes Chrysostomus. Es ist bemerkenswert, wie bie Chrysostomus neben dem Charisma seiner aussergewöhnlichen Rednergabe eine gewisse Menschenscheu hervortritt.

Der Verf. zeigt, wie die Predigten sich immer auf eine sittlich einwandfreie Lebensführung verlegen. Er erörtert weiterhin, wie die christliche Initiation in Antiochen aus diesen Taufkatechesen klar wird. Mit einer hundertseitigen Einleitung wird der Leser meisterhaft in die Lektüre dieser Taufkatechesen eingeführt.

Der griechische Text der Predigten 2/1-4 und 3/1-7 ist den kritischen Ausgaben in den 'Sources Chrétiennes' entnommen worden, die erste Katechese wird in der von J. P. Migne (PG 49, 231-240) übernommenen Edition des B. de Montfaucon, mit veränderter Einteilung in Paragraphen, wiedergegeben (S.100).

An einer Stelle hätte der Verf. auch die Interpunktion verändern können. Wie aus seiner Übersetzung hervorgeht, ist diese in dem griechischen Text von *Cat.* 1,3 fehlerhaft. (Es muss ein Semikolon nach παρ' αὐτοῦ stehen; das Semikolon nach οὐρανῶν soll getilgt werden, das hinter παραχατέθετο muss ein Komma werden).

Die Übersetzung ist im allgemeinen klar und genau. Einige kleine Bemerkungen: In Katechese 3/2 sagt Gott bezüglich der Sünde im Paradies: Ἡ ἄνεσις ἡ πολλὴ καὶ ἡ ἄδεια εἰς τοσαύτην σε παρακοὴν ἤγαγε ... Die Übersetzung lautet: »Die grosse Milde und Nachsicht haben dich zu grossem Ungehorsam verleitet«. Hier werden die Begriffe ἄνεσις und ἄδεια gedeutet, als ob sie sich auf Gott beziehen. Wie jedoch aus Katechese 3/4, 15-16 deutlich hervorgeht, handelt es sich um etwas Menschliches: ἄνεσις = das Fehlen der Spanning, Ruhe; ἄδεια = (Gefühl der) Freiheit. Diese Umstande haben den Menschen im Paradies zum Ungehorsam verleitet; »daher verurteile ich dich zu Mühe und Plage«, sagt Gott in 3/2,5.

Es ist merkwürdig, dass Chrysostomos an vielen Stellen in seinen Predigten, wenn er sich an sein Auditorium wendet, den Singular gebraucht: ἀγαπητέ, ἐννόησον usw. (z.B. 1,6; 3/3,1 und 11; 3/4,11 und 22). Der Verf. übersetzt stets im Plural. Ich weiss nicht, ob es möglich gewesen wäre den Singular, mit dem der Prediger sich offensichtlich an den individuellen Täufling wendet, im Deutschen zum Ausdruck zu bringen.

An einigen Stellen wäre ein Verweis auf die Heilige Schrift angebracht gewesen: In 1,1,16 erinnert ἐπεκτεινόμενοι πρὸς τὰ ἔμπροσθεν an Phil. 3,13; uns 3/2,22,21, ὡς λέων ὠρυόμενος ist I Petr. 5,8 (cf. Ps. 21,13) entnommen.

Diese kleinen Bemerkungen haben nur die Absicht, die Aufmerksamkeit der Leser auf eine wertvolle Ausgabe dieser sehr schönen Predigten des Johannes Chrysostomus zu lenken.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106 J. C. M. VAN WINDEN

Cyrill von Jerusalem, *Mystagogicae Catecheses/Mystagogische Katechesen*. Griechisch, Deutsch. Übersetzt und eingeleitet von Georg Röwekamp (Fontes Christiani 7). Freiburg usw., Herder, 1992. 197 S. DM 32,00.

Nachdem im 3.Band dieser Reihe Ambrosius' *De Sacramentis* und *De Mysteriis* und in den Bänden 6/1-2 die *Taufkatechesen* des Johannes Chrysostomus veröffentlicht wurden, folgen nun die dem Cyrill von Jerusalem zugeschriebenen fünf Mystagogischen Katechesen. Die Absicht dieser Mystagogie ist es, die Neugetauften weiter in die Mysterien einzuführen, 'damit sie den Sinn dessen einsehen, was an jenem Abend der Taufe mit ihnen geschehen ist' (vgl. *Myst.cat.* 1,1).

Im Gegensatz zu den mit Sicherheit von Cyrill stammenden Taufkatechesen ist die Autorschaft dieser Mystagogischen Katechesen umstritten. Die meisten Forscher meinen, dass Cyrills Nachfolger, Johannes, sie überarbeitet hat, wenn er nicht sogar insgesamt ihr Autor ist (vgl. S. 14). Der Verf. ist geneigt dieser Auffassung beizustimmen.

In der Einleitung schildert er die Initiation, wie sie in Jerusalem derzeit stattfand, und ihre Deutung, wie diese in den Mystagogischen Katechesen gegeben wird. Er erörtert weiterhin, wie sich diese Katechesen theologie- und liturgiegeschichtlich einordnen lassen. Die 90-seitige Einleitung ist sehr aufschlussreich.

Der griechische Text ist korrekt, die Übersetzung exakt und deutlich.

Es sei noch bemerkt, dass, wenn Cyrill (Johannes) in *Myst.cat.* 2,7 sagt, dass Christus alles was er ertrug δι' ἡμας καὶ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν gelitten hat, er die Formulierung des (nizänischen) Symbolums gebraucht. Und bei der Auslegung der Bitte des Vater Unsers um τὸν ἄρτον τὸν ἐπιούσιον sagt der Prediger: Es handelt sich hier nicht um das

gewöhnliche Brot, und er fährt fort: ὁ δε ἄρτος οὗτος ὁ ἅγιος ἐπιούσιός ἐστιν, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν οὐσίαν τῆς ψυχῆς κατατασσόμενος. Das heisst: ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐπιούσιος steht für (= ἀντι τοῦ) ὁ ἐπὶ τὴν οὐσίαν τῆς ψυχῆς κατατασσόμενος. Der ἄρτος ἐπιούσιος ist bestimmt für das Wesen (ἐπὶ τὴν οὐσίαν) der Seele. Der Verf. übersetzt mit Recht ἐπιούσιος mit 'wesentlich'. Wenn er jedoch die Worte ἀντὶ τοῦ ... κατατασσόμενος übersetzt mit »das heisst *im Gegensatz zu dem anderen* für das Wesen der Seele«, dann sind die kursivgedrückten Worte überflüssig. Hat er vielleicht das ἀντὶ τοῦ nicht richtig verstanden?

Wie dem auch sei, wiederum wird hier ein wichtiger Text des frühen Christentums den modernen Leser zugänglich gemacht.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106 J. C. M. VAN WINDEN

Wolfgang Wassilios Klein, *Die Argumentation in den griechisch-christlichen Antimanichaica* (Studies in Oriental Religions, Vol. 19). Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1991. X-264 pp., DM 88,—.

This dissertation, prepared under the supervision of the well-known Manichaeologist Hans-Joachim Klimkeit in Bonn, deals with an important theme. Dr. Klein examines the argumentation in the Greek-Christian Antimanichaica. To this end he investigates works of *inter alia* Didymus of Alexandria, Epiphanius of Salamis, John of Damascus, Serapion of Thmuis, Severus of Antioch, Titus of Bostra, and Zacharias of Mytilene.

After the introductory chapter, the main purpose of which is to give a survey of research to date and to word the *status quaestionis*, in Chapter 2 the author identifies the relevant sources. In the following three chapters he then gives a systematic appraisal of the reaction of the Catholic Christian Church: her attack on Manichaean dualism, her antagonism against other points of the Manichaean tradition (e.g. Mani's life, the organization of the Manichaean Church, and the Manichaean myth), and her apology for her own Christian tradition. In the sixth chapter, Klein summarizes the most important results of his investigation: the Catholic Christian Church had to find a (philosophical) solution of the problems of dualism and theodicy; she had to reformulate her doctrine of God, and, for instance, her Christology; in her reaction against Manichaean criticism she stressed

the unity of the Old and New Testament; and, for example, in her anti-Manichaean antagonism she defended the goodness of the visible creation and of its Creator. The final chapter is an *excursus* on Theodoros Abu Qurra (ca. 750-ca. 825), the Melchite bishop of Harran (or Charrân) whose writings are preserved in Arabic but who also wrote in Greek, and who gives testimony to the existence of a Manichaean congregation in ninth century Harran and even of a Manichaean monastery near that city.

Klein's study fills a real gap and turns out to be highly important to both Manichaeologists and Patristic scholars. Nevertheless, there is room for some critical remarks and further considerations. In comparison with preceding studies of the same genre like that of Peter Nagel on Titus of Bostra (*Die antimanichäischen Schriften des Titus von Bostra*, Habilitationsschrift Halle/Wittenberg 1967), those of François Decret on Augustine (*Aspects du Manichéisme dans l'Afrique romaine*, Paris 1970; *L'Afrique manichéenne, IVe-Ve siècles*, Paris 1978; both works focus on the 'Antimanichaeana Augustiniana'), and also the one of Edmund Beck on Ephraem Syrus (*Ephräms Polemik gegen Mani und die Manichäer [...]*, Louvain 1978), this investigation is rather enumerative and, especially from a doctrinal point of view, less profound. As is rightly and repeatedly remarked by the author (e.g. 16, 57, 127, 192, 231f.), the Fathers of the Catholic Christian Church time and again considered the Manichaeans to be *Christian heretics* and themselves as *orthodox* Christians (ὀρθόδοξοι, e.g. John of Damascus). Throughout his book, however, Klein insists on his distinction between 'Christians' and the 'Manichaeans'. Is it not high time, we may ask, in view of such important discoveries like that of the *Cologne Mani-Codex*, and especially in view of the wording of both Catholic Christians and Manichaean Christians themselves, to accept their own terminology? If so, then phrases such as, for instance, 'zum Christentum bekehrten Manichäer' (156) would have to be revised. With regard to the sources selected by Dr. Klein, it should be remarked that in Chapter 2 he only gives an (alphabetical) enumerative catalogue and that, in accordance with this, in his systematic account he takes rather indiscriminately his material from texts dating from the early fourth century up to and even including those of Niketas Choniates (ca. 1155-ca. 1215). In future research more must be said on their interdependence.

To what extant further research in this field is able to improve on and also to correct some of Klein's findings, has meanwhile been demonstrated by the author himself. His rather curious statements on the lack of Coptic Antimanichaica (8-9) he now rebuts excellently in a well-documented study on Schenute of Atripe ('Ein koptisches Antimanichaikon von Schenute von Atripe', *Studia Manichaica*, hrsg. von G. Wießner und H.-J. Klimkeit, Wiesbaden 1992, 367-379). Also about Manichaeism in Georgian literature more can be said than Klein (10) deems possible: in the near future Tamila Mgaloblishvili of the Institute of Manuscripts of the Georgian Academy of Sciences will publish on this.

NL-3703 AH *Zeist*, Van Renesselaan 24 J. VAN OORT

Gregory E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition. Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum 64), Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1992. XV + 500 pages. Dfl. 220,—.

This is the revised version of Sterling's dissertation at Graduate Theological Union (directed by J.R. Donahue). It is an immensely learned book that requires from the reader an ability to read not only English but also German, French, Greek, Latin, Hebrew, and Coptic, because the text is interspersed with many (sometimes long) quotations in these languages, especially in Greek, without accompanying translations. There is much to be learned from this well-documented work with its 1840 densely packed footnotes. Actually the book is about the discovery of a new literary genre, called 'apologetic historiography'. In the introductory chapter ("Genre and Historiography", 1-19) S. explains that his research arose out of dissatisfaction with current definitions of the genre of both Luke-Acts and Josephus' *Ant. Jud.*, and he also deals with some methodological issues. Anticipating his conclusions he classifies both works as 'apologetic historiography', which he defines as "the story of a subgroup of people in an extensive prose narrative written by a member of the group who follows the group's own traditions but hellenizes them in an effort to establish the identity of the group within the setting of the larger world" (17). Ch. 2 ("Greek Ethnography", 20-54) is the first of four chapters which trace the

development of apologetic historiography out of Greek ethnography. S. tries to demonstrate that each new phase in this process was the result of a radical change in the political situation. He discusses the rise of ethnography (sparked by the spread of the Persian Empire) with Hecataeus of Miletus who laid down the basic pattern of the genre: the land, the history, *thaumasia*, and *nomoi* of a people. Then S. deals with Herodotus who is "primarily responsible for joining history to ethnography" (51). In this early phase, in which Greeks and non-Greeks still remained relatively distant from one another, the entire process and the standards were Hellenic. Ch. 3 ("Ethnography in Transition", 55-102) discusses Hecataeus of Abdera's *Aigyptiaka* and Megasthenes' *Indika*. The new political circumstances under and after Alexander the Great brought about a change of perspective: Hecataeus and Megasthenes wrote as Greeks in adopted homelands and they drew upon native sources. They stand out as the first of "a group of works which champion an individual nation or people over against all others" (91). Each began the process of fusing their loyalties, but they still remained outsiders to the countries they celebrated. Ch. 4 ("The Origins of Apologetic Historiography", 103-136) describes the fundamental change brought about in the early third century by Berossus (*Babyloniaka*) and Manetho (*Aigyptiaka*). Now natives begin to 'translate' their own sacred records (covering history from creation to the present) into Greek in a reaction against Greek misinterpretations: "The result was the creation of a new literary genre which *challenged* and *identified* with Hellenism at the same time" (103). Both authors stressed that their respective civilizations were the most ancient and glorious known to mankind and they claimed that the Greeks were their heirs and debtors. It was this marriage of Hellenism and native Near Eastern traditions from which the new genre of apologetic historiography proper was born. Ch. 5 ("The Hellenistic Jewish Historians", 137-225) deals with Demetrius the Chronographer, Artapanus, Eupolemus and (the Samaritan) Pseudo-Eupolemus, all of whom rewrote the biblical stories to the effect that the Jewish ancestors were the most ancient *Kulturbringer*. In spite of the enormous diversity of viewpoints among these Jewish authors a unifying theme is that "they all wrote *ad maiorem Iudaeorum gloriam*" and that they all "claim the superiority of the Jewish nation over both other Oriental people and Greeks" (223). In ch. 6 ("The *Antiquitates Judaicae* of Josephos", 226-310) S. demonstrates that in the Roman period this

Jewish tradition reached its apogee in Josephus; he, too, made other great cultures derive from Judaism. His bi-polar stance, i.e., "an apology to Hellenism through the glorification of the Jewish past and the Hellenization of Israel's traditions, appears to be the dominant hermeneutical device through which the historian shaped his *magnum opus*" (297). "His message is that the antiquity and previous rights of the Jews ought to be respected in the Hellenistic world" (393). Finally, in ch. 7 ("Luke-Acts", 311-394) S. returns to his original point of departure. He regards the *Doppelwerk* as a Christian specimen of the genre, written by an author who was either a Jew or a person who had very close ties to Judaism. "Luke-Acts tells the story of Christianity from its beginnings through its transformation from a Palestinian sect into an empire-wide movement some 70 years later. It is, therefore not the story of Jesus nor of Paul. It is the story of Christianity, i.e., of a people. In this sense it is reminiscent of historical works which relate the story of a particular people" (349). Luke conceived of his work as the continuation of the LXX and therefore as a sacred narrative. Since by means of Jesus' genealogy (Lk. 3) the author takes his tradition back to the beginnings of time and since he presents Christianity as legitimately claiming continuity with the tradition of Israel, which was recognized for its antiquity, Luke-Acts may rightly be regarded as apologetic historiography. This final chapter will be viewed with some suspicion by students of the Lukan writings since here S.'s case is not always as convincing as in the other chapters. But it cannot be denied that it is a fascinating thesis that has at least as many merits as quite a number of other hypotheses on the genre of Luke-Acts.

Some minor comments and points of criticism. S. has the habit of writing the names of Greek authors in their non-latinized forms, but he is not consistent, so that we have side by side 'Diodoros Sikelos' and 'Aristotle', 'Hekataios' and 'Homer'. Curiously enough, the name of Porphyry is constantly (mis)spelled as Porphery (instead of Porphyrios), e.g. 36, 98, 161, 449. Worse is that the adjectives derived from the Greek spellings are less than felicitous: Hekataion, Diodoron, Eusebion, Polybion, etc. (e.g. 29, 39, 61, 64, 123, 289; but cf. the correct 'Herodotean' at 40!). The passage on Hecataeus' Περὶ Ἰουδαίων (esp. 90-1) is ingenious but very speculative. I cannot follow the logic of the statement at p. 142: "The fact that there are 45 pages in Mras' edition of Eusebios which are directly attributable to Polyhistor leads me to conclude that Eusebios has preserved the bulk of his predecessor". The

same applies to his remark at p. 184: "There is no evidence that Greeks read works written by nationals except for collectors like Polyhistor. The real world audience of the work is *therefore* Jews [ital. added, PWvdH]". The discussion of the reliability of Polyhistor's excerpts at 150-2 might have profited from the treatment of that matter in my 'The Interpretation of the Bible by the Minor Hellenistic Jewish Authors', in M.J. Mulder, *Mikra* (CRINT II 1) Assen-Philadelphia 1988, 519-546, an essay in which I cover much the same ground as S.'s whole ch. 5 but which he never mentions in spite of his impressive bibliographies. On the various claims to have discovered astrology (177 with n. 208) see also the Egyptian Chaeremon,. fr. 2, with the notes *ad loc* in my edition (Leiden ²1987). The date of the destruction of the temple at Shechem by John Hyrcanus (190) is now disputed, it may be 110 instead of 129/8; see R. Pummer, Einführung in den Stand der Samaritanerforschung, in F. Dexinger & R. Pummer (Hrsgg.), *Die Samaritaner* (Darmstadt 1992) 59. At p. 205 I find S.'s statement that "the Samaritans accepted Hellenization without the struggle which characterized their counterparts to the south" too facile; it is an *argumentum e silentio* which is unwarranted. *Ad* p. 219: Eupolemus does not have Solomon write to the kings of Phoenicia and Egypt as *primus inter pares*, he writes to them as their superior (see my essay in *Mikra* 538). *Ad* p. 341-2: The best illustration of the pejorative connotation of πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν in Lk. 1:1 is Luke's contemporary, Thessalus, *De virtutibus herbarum* 1, also in the first line of the work. *Ad* p. 365: on the parallel between the stories of doors opening of their own accord in Acts 12 and Artapanus fr. 3 see O. Weinreich, *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien*, Darmstadt 1968, 38-290. There can be no doubt that Sterling's book is to be most warmly welcomed.

Heidelberglaan 2, Postbus 80.105 P.W. VAN DER HORST
3508 TC *Utrecht*

G. O'Daly, *The Poetry of Boethius*. London, Duckworth, 1991. XII, 252 p.

Sed abite potius, Sirenes usque in exitium dulces: with this clear phrase in the first prose section of Boethius' *Consolatio Philosophiae* the lady Philosophy gives her marching orders to those Muses who stifle

man's rational judgement by their poetry. This does not, however, imply the end of all poetical exercises. That would have been unlikely in view of the similarity with the imprisonment of Socrates, who sang a prophetic—and, one might add, philosophic—swan song (Plato, *Phaedo* 85a-b). Indeed, there is ample room for poetry, according to Philosophy, provided the patient is left to her specific musical sway, and thus she continues her command just quoted with: *meisque eum Musis curandum sanandumque relinquite* (*Cons.* 1 p. 1). Twenty years ago on one of the first pages of her important study *Die Gedichte in der Consolatio Philosophiae des Boethius* (Heidelberg 1972) H. Scheible was quite clear in her interpretation of this phrase: when Philosophy sets her Muses against the seductive Sirens, "können damit auf keinen Fall die im weiteren Verlauf des Buches auftretende Gedichte gemeint sein" (9). Although this verdict may be right in a strictly literal sense, its wording could easily be misunderstood as a depreciation of what Scheible herself calls Boethius' "Gedankenlyrik" (11).

Without any intention of polemizing against Scheible's formula, professor O'Daly obviously has not the slightest tendency to underrate this "entirely different kind of poetry about more important themes" (43) even than natural philosophy, which occupies an honourable place in traditional Roman poetry. In his highly interesting second chapter, which is devoted to the poetics of the *Consolatio*, he endeavours to formulate Boethius' implicit views of the art of poetry or, to put it in more fashionable terms, his "immanent poetics" (32). On the one hand, poetry "deals in fictions and is an instrument of emotional manipulation" (60), but it can also "contain and express philosophical truths" (73). This is the more remarkable in that O'D. convincingly explains that Boethius' poems are not composed as specifically Neoplatonic texts, e.g. after the theories of Proclus. In fact, the continuous thread in the whole book is Boethius' indebtedness to the Latin literary tradition. This entails a point of view which differs markedly from Scheible's strategy, which aimed first and foremost at elucidating the contents of the poems and left only restricted room to a discussion of literary examples and parallels. This can be illustrated by the concept of nature and its inner harmony or disharmony, to which the longest chapter of the book is devoted (104-177). In this chapter O'D. goes to considerable lengths to show that "the concept of an active immanent force, in virtue of which nature coheres" is primarily dealt with by Boethius in an intertextual relation to "his Latin poetic predecessors", with "the influ-

ence of the geometric cosmology of the *Timaeus* and related Neoplatonic concepts'' (126) playing second fiddle. Here O'D. seems to touch upon the fact noted by Scheible (4) that Stoic language is more conspicuous in the *Consolatio* than in Boethius' other works, since this language has found its way to the relevant Latin poetic tradition too.

As can be expected in view of O'D.'s approach, his book contains much detailed interpretation of individual passages, at times involving longish, but courteous, critical assessments of other scholars' views. The danger of esotericism appears on the horizon in some of these cases, but O'D. does his best to ward it off, i.a. by providing a translation of all the texts quoted and discussed. His detailed treatment of the intertextuality in the poems incurs another risk, viz. the conclusion by the readers that Boethius is using or even rewriting specific poems. creating such impressions is wellnigh unavoidable—after all the text of such poems simply has to be quoted—, but O'D. continually tries to counter them by referring to more than one example, so that he is fully entitled to his own conclusion, viz. that Boethius ''is rewriting a complex tradition'' (235). Recognition of this literary tradition in order to enhance the pleasure of reading is thus O'D.'s main objective. Those who want to reach as deep an understanding of Boethius' poetical achievement as possible will do well to add this guide for ''a realization of the many kinds of allusiveness'' (237) in the *Consolatio* to Scheible's still valuable analyses.

2353 BM *Leiderdorp*, van Effendreef 15 J. DEN BOEFT

Vigiliae Christianae 47 (1993), 209-225, E. J. Brill, Leiden

JOHN 1:5 IN THE *ORATION* AND *DIATESSARON* OF TATIAN
CONCERNING THE READING KATAAAMBANEI

BY

T. BAARDA

Introduction

The allusions and quotations in the Oration

A peculiar feature of the *Oratio ad Graecos* of Tatian is, at first sight, the absence of almost any explicit quotation from the Biblical text. This might strike the reader as strange after he has been told by the author himself that the conversion of the author was occasioned by the discovery of the archaic and divine 'barbarian writings'.[1] However, as an apologist he does not stand alone in this respect. 'The Oration'—Grant observes[2]—"provides an excellent example of the rule that apologists generally make allusions rather than give explicit quotations". Tertullian's *Apologeticum* is another example.[3] The idea is that an apologist in a polemical work against a pagan audience cannot argue from a source that was not well-known to them.[4] Even if it is true that apologies of this kind were implicitly planned "to build the ego of the Christian by destroying that of the Greek",[5] one has to recognize the fact that Tatian intended to write both for Christians *and* pagans.[6] However, since he expresses so clearly his high esteem for the 'barbarian writings', which he thinks of as 'divine' and 'inspired' and also as older than Greek philosophy, one might have expected him to quote from them more often than he actually does.[7] Meanwhile, in spite of the small number of references to the Bible,[8] it is clear that his language is to a certain extent 'Biblical'[9] in that he uses words or terms borrowed from the Old and New Testaments.

Tatian and the fourth Gospel

What may surprise us as well is that Tatian does not quote more frequently from the Gospels, if one considers the fact that he was responsi-

ble for a harmony of the Gospels, the *Diatessaron*. There are only two vague allusions to Mt 13:44[10] and Lk 6:25[11] in his apology;[12] compared with that, his interest in the fourth Gospel is considerable. One can understand, why Olshausen writes, "Aus der einzigen Apologie, die uns von *Tatians* Werken allein noch geblieben ist, können wir nur über den Gebrauch des Evangeliums des Johannes Spuren auffinden"[13], since the main interest of the orthodox authors on the Canon in the nineteenth century was to prove that the fourth Gospel existed at an earlier time than some critical scholars wished to accept. But what Olshausen minimalizes on the one hand he exaggerated on the other hand, when he writes. "Tatian citirt ja auch eine Menge andrer Stellen aus dem Johannes", besides John 1:5. In fact the only other passages that can be adduced are:

1. John 1:1(*Orat* 5:1): θεὸς ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ, τὴν δὲ ἀρχὴν λόγου δύναμιν παρειλήφαμεν κτλ.[14]
2. John 1:3 (*Orat* 19:4): πάντα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ γέγονεν οὐδὲ ἕν.[15]
3. John 1:9 (*Orat* 13:2): λόγος μέν ἐστι τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ φῶς.[16]

These three texts are referring to the text of the Johannine Prologue,[17] just as John 1:5, which we will discuss here. So one might suggest that Tatian, just as his teacher Justin, had taken notice of only the beginning of this Gospel, mainly for christological interests, if there was not another text:

4. John 4:24: (*Orat* 4:1): πνεῦμα ὁ θεός.[18]

It is very likely that Tatian had knowledge of the fourth Gospel, when he wrote his *Oration*.[19] In earlier days this testimony of the *Oration* was for scholars the main reason to postulate that the Gospel of John was really one of the sources that Tatian had woven into his harmony, the *Diatessaron*.

In the nineteenth century, when some critical scholars tried to show that the fourth Gospel was a late document, these few references to John's Gospel became an issue. The rationalist Bretschneider[20] who strongly objected the authenticity of this Gospel discarded the testimony of Tatian as having nothing to do with this Gospel: "Certum est Tatianum alterius verba laudasse, cuiusnam incertum. Non significavit, unde verba repetierit; nec adeo dixit se locum codicis vel libri cuiusdam sacri laudasse.... Nonne fieri potuit ut Tatianus et Noster (sc. Pseudo-Johannes) simul illam formulam ex apocrypho quodam, quorum tot periere, haurirent". This was the line along which several critics tried

to deny the importance of these references to John. The most renowned of them, the author of *Supernatural Religion*, repeated that Tatian did not quote from John, for he does not mention his source nor indicate that he quoted from an authoritative document.[21] He was apparently less sure about his arguments against Tatian's use of John 1:3 and 1:5, for he observes that even if Tatian quoted from this Gospel, it would only prove that this Gospel existed "a century and a half after the events which it records", but not that it was apostolic or historically reliable. Scholars who rejected the existence of Johannine quotations or allusions did so to infer from it that Tatian did not use the fourth Gospel as a source for his *Diatessaron*. Since the beginning of the modern Diatessaron research, which began with Th. Zahn,[22] it became obvious that Tatian had used the Gospel of John as one of his source texts. "The evidence that he (*i.e.* Tatian) knew and accepted the Fourth Gospel is beyond the reach of any reasonable doubt".[23] There is no scholar anymore who would wish to deny that Tatian had access to the Fourth Gospel. This may be a good starting-point for our discussion of John 1:5 in the *Oration* of Tatian.

John 1:5 in the Oration, ch. 13

The Text in its Context

In chapter 13 Tatian writes concerning the mortality of the soul.[24] 'The soul in itself, men of Greece, is not immortal, but mortal. However, the very (soul) has the power not to die. For it (that is, the soul 'an sich') dies and dissolves together with the body, if it does not know truth; but later on, at the end of the world, it arises together with the body, while by punishment it suffers death eternally.[25] On the other hand, it does not die, although it is dissolved temporarily, if it acquires the Knowledge of God. In itself, it is 'darkness', and there is nothing of light in it.[26] Now, this is <what is meant by> what is said: "The darkness does not seize the light". For, in fact, <the> soul did not save the spirit, but it was saved by it. And the light seized[27] the darkness <for the soul> for which[28] the Logos is, indeed, the Light of God—but the ignorant soul <remains> darkness'.

In the course of his argumentation Tatian seems to quote, for he speaks of τὸ εἰρημένον, *lit.* 'that what is said', that is, 'the saying', 'the word'. This seems to suggest that Tatian refers to an authoritative text.

Those critics who deny that Tatian refers here to the Gospel of John base their case on the inexact way in which he cites this reference: he does not say from which source he quotes, so that one cannot assume that it was from a Gospel text.[29] Those who defend the Johannine origin of the saying observe that this was a usual expression to denote a biblical passage;[30] they find in it even a solemn reference to Scripture.[31]

The Text

The reading of Tatian's reference is different from what we find in John 1:5, for we read ἡ σκοτία τὸ φῶς οὐ καταλαμβάνει, 'the darkness does not seize the light', where the Gospel text reads: καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν, 'and the darkness did not seize it', that is, the light, or if one reads αὐτόν with some witnesses (H *13 e a q* Theodotus—cf. Clement, below), the Logos. One cannot say with Olshausen that 'die Stelle wörtlich so im Johannes steht'.[32] The text of Tatian can be analyzed in the following way:

1. ἡ σκοτία in agreement with Jn 1:5. This is remarkable, because Tatian wanted to illustrate his view that the soul was identical with or determined by (τὸ) σκότος. This word he could have used in his quotation if he were merely paraphrasing his source text. That he uses σκοτία means that he wished to keep to the Johannine expression. This becomes also clear from the words in the following sentence: ψυχὴ γὰρ οὐκ αὐτὴ τὸ πνεῦμα ἔσωσεν, ἐσώθη δὲ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ· καὶ τὸ φῶς τὴν σκοτίαν κατέλαβεν, of which the last clause is an *inversion* of Jn 1:5. Here again σκοτία is used, whereas immediately after that Tatian himself prefers to identify the soul with σκότος again.

2. Tatian writes: τὸ φῶς, which does not occur in Jn 1:5. It was necessary for him to explicitly mention the light here, for otherwise the quotation would not have been understandable. It shows, however, that Tatian read in his text αὐτό, not the *varia lectio* αὐτόν.

3. The fact that Tatian added to his *inversion* of Jn 1:5 καὶ τὸ φῶς τὴν σκοτίαν κατέλαβεν (see above ad 1) the words ἤ λόγος μέν ἐστι τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ φῶς,[33] is interesting in that it connects his reference to and inversion of Jn 1:5 with the theme of the beginning of the Prologue, Jn 1:1-5: the λόγος refers to Jn 1:1f., which in its turn is connected with φῶς (1:4). Tatian characterizes this light as τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ φῶς, laying emphasis on its source, whereas Jn 1:5, τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, lays stress upon the fact that it was meant for mankind.[34]

4. The most remarkable variation is the present tense καταλαμβάνει instead of the aorist κατέλαβεν. We have already mentioned the fact that in his inversion of Jn 1:5 Tatian used the aorist tense, which may be an indication that this was the form used in his source text. But why this present tense in his quotation? We must be aware that in the exegetical tradition the aorist has been explained in three ways: historical, complexive or gnomic. If Tatian took it in the gnomic sense, his change of the aorist into present tense seems wholly justified. He wished to express that what has been described as a specific past event, the rejection of the light by those who did not recognize (Jn 1:10 ἔγνω) or accept (1:11 παρέλαβον) Jesus, was symbolic for the *continuous* relationship between light and darkness, spirit and soul. Tatian does not wish to deny the *historical* character of the Jesus event, for later on he speaks of that tragic rejection of the 'servant of the God who suffered'[35] by those very souls that did not obey (αἱ...μὴ πειθόμεναι), who therefore turned out to be θεομάχοι, ennemies of God.[36] This historic event, however, signals what is always true, even for the period in which Tatian writes: τοιοῦτοι τινές ἐστε καὶ ὑμεῖς, ὦ Ἕλληνες....[37] One might conclude from this that Tatian could have read an aorist in Jn 1:5 and have taken it as a reference to a past situation, and could at the same time have interpreted the text as referring to a universal process that is of all times. This new application that occasioned him to write a present tense in his quotation may have been part of an exegetical tradition.[38] So the 'historical' statement of John could become an 'anthropological' pronouncement.[39] In any event, there is no reason to suggest that there was of necessity a *varia lectio* in Jn 1:5, καταλαμβάνει instead of κατέλαβεν, on which Tatian was dependent in this case. That there was ever a variant reading of this kind has been defended by A. Resch, who in dealing with the text of Clement of Alexandria, wrote: "Das Praesens...ist bei Clemens Al. durch die sich gleichbleibende dreimalige Wiederholung sowie durch das Zusammentreffen mit Tatian als gute vorcanonische Lesart beglaubigt".[40] This seems to suggest that the original reading of Jn 1:5 may have been καταλαμβάνει, which afterwards in the canonical redaction was changed into the aorist. We will discuss the text of Clement later on, but here we may conclude that there is no compelling reason to assume that Tatian read in his text a present tense; he only wrote it down when referring to the verse in the course of his argument.

5. One question remains: how did Tatian understand καταλαμβάνει?

L. Leloir, in his discussion on the meaning of ܬܦܣ in the Syriac Diatessaron, has emphasized that the verb has the meaning *apprehendere* rather than *comprehendere*. An argument is also the function of the verb καταλαμβάνειν in the *Oration*, ch. 13: 'Les ténèbres n'ont pu saisir la lumière, et c'est la lumière qui a saisi les ténèbres. Elle les a saisies, c.-à-d. qu'elle s'en est emparé victorieusement''.[41] There is rather ''une attitude de conquête'' than ''une attitude d'acceuil'', so that the meaning is vicerunt rather than receperunt: ''et la lumière s'est emparée des ténèbres''. Leloir is correct in his assessment that there is the connotation of conquest in the chapter. However, that is only part of its use. The verb καταλαμβάνω, 'to seize', has an ambiguity which Tatian had made use of. When he writes ἡ σκοτία τὸ φῶς οὐ καταλαμβάνει, he may refer to the fact that the dark soul by itself could not *appropriate* the light. It is only the souls that are obedient (πειθόμεναι) to wisdom that are able to do so: σφίσιν αὐταῖς ἐφεῖλκον τὸ πνεῦμα συγγένες.[42] From this perspective one may attribute to the verb the meaning 'to seize' in the sense of 'to comprehend'.[43] From the perspective of the observation of Tatian mentioned before that the souls which did not obey but rejected the servant of the God who suffered were θεομάχοι, one might understand 'does not seize' in a pejorative sense of 'does not accept' or even 'does not apprehend'.

The Parallel in Clement of Alexandria

Three Quotations in the Paedagogue

1. Clement quotes Jn 1:5 three times in the Paedagogue.[44]

A. I.vi.28,3 (in a paraphrase).[45]...καὶ τὸ σκότος αὐτὸν οὐ καταλαμβάνει.
B. II.ix.79,3 (in a paraphrase).[46]...καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸν οὐ καταλαμβάνει.
C. II.x.99,6 (in a quotation).[47]...καὶ ἡ σκοτία, φησίν, αὐτὸ οὐ καταλαμβάνει.

2. Clement's text is referred to for the reading αὐτόν: 'It is clear that Clement read αὐτόν, not αὐτό,[48] Barnard concludes, and refers to the fact that αὐτόν was found in a few manuscripts. The masculine form is also found in the Excerpts from Theodotus connected with Clement's name.[49] Did Clement really read αὐτόν in Jn 1:5? This is not so certain as the attestation might suggest. In passage **A** Clement has quoted Eph.5:8 (...ποτε σκότος, νῦν δὲ φῶς...). He agrees with those who say that ''man has not yet received the perfect gift, since that will be at the time of resurrection''. Therefore man is not yet light, but he is in the light,

and darkness does not seize him. Clement does not read here the text within the context of Jn 1:1-5, in which αὐτόν would refer to the Logos. However, he has introduced ὁ ἄνθρωπος (whom the ancients called φῶς, 'man') and speaks of him, so that he could not use αὐτό any more. Clement may have consciously changed the word by replacing masculine for neuter. In passage **B** a similar application of the text is found: he observes that believers should—according to Luke 12:35ff.—be awake. They are similar to angels who are called ἐγρήγοροι (cf. Dan 4:10 ['A]). He who has the light—ὁ τὸ φῶς ἔχων— is awake, an alluminated one (πεφωτισμένος), of whom can be said that darkness does not seize *him*. Here again Clement could not use αὐτό, since he applies it to the believer.[50] Finally, in **C**, Clement speaks of darkness as connected with sin (II.x,99,3ff.); he summons his readers not to use darkness as a cover for sinning, for 'the light is living within us'. Then he continues with a quotation (φησίν) of Jn 1:5, and now he writes down its text with the neuter pronoun αὐτό, not so much because he quotes, but because there was no reason for him to change his text here. There is no need to follow the textual critics who employ Clement as a witness for the reading αὐτόν.

καταλαμβάνει *or* κατέλαβεν?

3. The reading καταλαμβάνει is found in all three passages: was it in Clement's text of Jn 1:5? We saw that Resch used Clement and Tatian to support his view of a pre-canonical text of the verse in question.[51] Other scholars, however, speak of it as an interpretation of κατέλαβεν,[52] as a philosophical generalization, a Christian 'Gemeinplatz' that can be used as argument in several circumstances.[53] The battle between Light and Darkness was seen by Clement as an ongoing reality in this world.[54] This may explain the occurrence of the present tense in **A** and **B**. In **C**, however, we have a *quotation* (φησίν) with the present tense. Does this mean that Clement did not read an aorist in Jn 1:5? Here again we have to reckon with the context of the quotation. What Clement wishes to emphasize is the present state of the believers: they should not use darkness (σκότος) as cover for sins, but should be conscious of the fact that the light lives in them. The inner light is their strength against sinning, for it says: 'and the darkness does not seize them'. Even the night becomes different: the *night* is usually the time for sexual intercourse (II.x.97,1f.) and *darkness* serves as a cover for illegitimate passions

(II.x.99,3f.). They, who have this inner light, are not overtaken by *darkness*, even 'the *night* becomes illuminated by temperate thoughts' (καταυγάζεται δὲ ἡ νύξ τῷ σώφρονι λογισμῷ). It is obvious that Clement, in spite of his 'literal' quotation (with αὐτό contra **A-B**, and with σκοτία despite the use of σκότος in the context), had to replace the aorist of his Biblical text by a present tense to suit his purpose.

John 1:5 in the Diatessaron of Tatian

The problem of Reconstruction

1. As we have mentioned earlier, the quotation of Jn 1:5 in the *Oration* of Tatian had become an issue in the nineteenth century debate of whether Tatian knew and used the fourth Gospel. The real issue in this debate was whether this apologist had included 'John' in his famous harmony, the *Diatessaron*, which would imply that this Gospel had an authoritative character in his time. One may say that since 1881, the year in which Th. Zahn had published his reconstruction of the Diatessaron,[55] this debate has faded. It became clear that the earliest harmony of the Gospels had not only included Johannine material, but also made it—together with Matthew—the basic framework of its structural arrangement of Gospel materials. The main problem with which scholars were confronted after the publication of the Latin translation of the Armenian version of Ephraem's Syriac commentary on the harmony[56] was the problem of the reconstruction of the text. How can we construct a reading in Syriac, if we only know it through Armenian via a Latin translation? It is one of the merits of Zahn that he, due to his great textual genius, often hit the mark in his approach. In Jn 1:5 he reads

[a] Et haec lux in tenebris lucebat,
[b] et tenebrae eam non vicerunt.

2. This text surprises by the addition of *haec*, the reading *lucebat* for φαίνει, and the rendering *vicerunt* [litt. *vicit*, plural due to *tenebrae*] for κατέλαβεν. Zahn, however, could demonstrate that this text was in agreement with part of Syriac tradition:

1. *Et haec* suggests that the Ephraem read ܗܢܐ in his Diatessaron, a reading also found in the Curetonian manuscript of the Vetus Syra (Sy^{c}), the Peshitta (Sy^{p}) and Aphrahat.

2. *lucebat* is in agreement with ܡܢܗܪ ܗܘܐ of Sy^{c}, Aphrahat, against Sy^{P} and the Harcleian version (Sy^{h}), who have merely ܡܢܗܪ = φαίνει.

3. *eam...vicerunt* was nothing else, in his view, than the rendering of the ambiguous Syriac expression ܐܕܪܟܗ found in the Syriac versions and in Aphrahat. If Zahn would have given a Syriac retranslation of the pertinent passage it would have fully agreed with the Curetonian Syriac and with Aphrahat's text:[57]

ܘܗܘ ܢܘܗܪܐ 1 And the very Light (or: And, He, the Light)
ܒܚܫܘܟܐ ܡܢܗܪ ܗܘܐ 2 in (the) darkness was shining (or: shone)
ܘܚܫܘܟܐ ܠܐ ܐܕܪܟܗ. 3 and (the) darkness did not seize it (or: Him).

3. Later reconstructions could not change the result of Zahn's reconstruction. In J.H. Hill's reconstruction of the text in Ephraem's commentary, for which J.A. Robinson was responsible, we read: "And [itself] the light was shining in darkness, and darkness overcame it not".[58] Remarkably enough, the word *itself* (Arm. **ինքն**) is put in brackets, which means that this word was in Armenian, but idiomatic and not implying a various reading.[59] This is a step backwards, when compared with Zahn, who correctly demonstrated that the word rendered Syriac ܗܘ. Whereas Zahn had not yet compared the Arabic Diatessaron, which was published by A. Ciasca in 1888, Hill could give also a translation of this Arabic text. The translation of Jn 1:5 reads:[60]

[a] And the light shineth in the darkness,
[b] and the darkness overcame it not.

The influence of the Peshitta is apparent in *shineth* (ينير , impf.), but T^{A} omits even the characteristic ܗܘ of the Syriac. On the other hand, it preserves the Syriac ܠܐ ܐܕܪܟܗ in the rendering: لم تدركه. Hill's translation '*overcame* it not' is possibly influenced by Robinson's translation of the Armenian. He adds in a note: Lit. "took hold of"; but in his second edition he renders: '*comprehended* it not' (in a note: Lit. "comprehended", *sic*), which agrees with the rendering of Ciasca, 'eam non comprehenderunt', cf. Marmardji's 'ne l'a point comprise'. Hogg chose for 'apprehended it not',[61] Preuschen for 'hat es nicht ergriffen'.[62] However, whatever the precise meaning of the Arabic may have been,[63] it reproduces here its Syriac *Vorlage* almost literally.

4. The Armenian edition published by Leloir gave scholars the opportunity to study anew the text of Ephraem:

[a] **եւ ինքն լոյսն ի խաւարի անդ լուսաւոր էր**
'Et ipsa lux in tenebris lucebat'[64]

The Armenian follows the Syriac construction of the participle with ܗܘܐ it presents *lowsawor ēr* instead of *lowsaworeac*ʿ which implies that it read *lucens erat* rather than *lucebat*.

[b] **և խաւար զնա ոչ յաղթեաց.**
'et tenebrae eam non vicerunt.'[65]

The publication of the Syriac text of Ephraem's commentary by Leloir in 1963 finally enabled scholars to read the Syriac text of our passage:[66]

[a] ܘܗܘ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܒܚܫܘܟܐ ܡܢܗܪ ܗܘܐ
[b] ܘܚܫܘܟܐ ܠܐ ܐܕܪܟܗ.

This was the text that was already known from Sy^{c} and Aphrahat and was the text that Zahn in his reconstruction had assumed as Diatessaron text. It was on the basis of this text that Leloir presented his reconstruction: [a] Et ipsa lux in tenebris lucebat, [b] et tenebrae non comprehenderunt.[67] This was, although with the omission of the initial *et*, also the text in the reconstruction of Ortiz de Urbina[68] and Molitor.[69]

5. The Syriac text of the Diatessaron as it can now be established with the support of Aphrahat and Ephraem presents us with the following elements that are different from the Greek text:

a) ܘܗܘ (for καὶ)—This could be rendered in two ways: 1. *And He* (that is the Logos), *the Light, was shining*, or 2. *And the very Light was shining*, cf. Arm. **ինքն**. In the first case ܗ- (in ܐܕܪܟܗ) refers to the Logos (= αὐτόν); in the second case it refers to the light (= αὐτό).

b) ܡܢܗܪ ܗܘܐ, 'was shining' (or: shone[70]), where the Greek has φαίνει. The present tense is found in ܡܢܗܪ of Sy^{p}, Sy^{h} and Sy^{pal}, apparently as a correction after the Greek text. Ephraem, in his comments, emphasizes the past tense: "with respect to this expression 'it was shining', however, one should not hear it in a simple way (that is, as if it has no specific meaning, B), but on the basis of what it does not express: in darkness it is shining (ܡܢܗܪ ܗܘ)".[71] Ephraem does not compare here the Diatessaron with the Peshitta (which does not present ܗܘ), but applies here a logical, hermeneutical procedure.[72]

c) ܐܕܪܟܗ 'seized it (or: Him)'. It is not easy to determine the precise meaning of ܐܕܪܟ which usually renders καταλαμβάνειν and shares its many connotations. The Armenian translator has chosen the equivalent **զնա ոչ յաղթեաց**, a rendering that has been found in Agathangełus[73] and Aphrahat[74] and which usually is rendered with 'eam non vicerunt'.[75] This rendering is different from that of the Armenian Vulgate (ed. Zohrab), **զնա ոչ եղեւ հասու**, did not understand it',[76]

which is once found in Aphrahat's Armenian text.[77] A third rendering is found in the Armenian Aphrahat, namely **ոչ ծամանէր նմա**, 'did not catch (overtake) it'.[78]

6. Leloir was not quite satisfied with his rendering of the final words ܠܐ ܐܕܪܟܗ, 'non comprehenderunt eam'. The Armenian translator had interpreted it as **նմա ոչ յալթեաց**, 'eam non vicerunt', a reading which Lyonnet had attributed to what he calls Arm-1, the earliest translation in Armenian.[79] There is no reason to think that behind the Armenian version was a verb other than ܐܕܪܟܗ, as has been suggested.[80] The Armenian verb can, besides 'vincere', have the connotation of 'obtinere', or 'to take possession of'. However, it has nothing to do with 'comprehendere' in the sense of 'to understand'. This is why Leloir, in his final conclusions in which he presents the text-critical results of his reconstruction, adopts the translation: 'tenebrae eam non apprehenderunt'[81], instead of '... comprehenderunt'.[82] In my view, one should avoid contrasting these two meanings: one has to acknowledge that commentators, confronted with an ambiguous word, could easily apply two different exegeses and leave them side by side in their expositions. There is no reason, therefore, to conclude from it: 'Die Lage im Kommentar ist verwirrend zweispältig'.[83] There is even less reason to infer from this difference between what has been called a 'Greek' exegesis and a more Semitic exposition,[84] that one has to ask whether both expositions could belong to Ephraem.[85] The ambiguity of Ephraem's comment depends on the ambiguity of the verb. As we have seen in Tatian's Oration the same is true in the apologist's interpretation of κατέλαβεν almost in one and the same sentence.

Whatever the meaning of the verb for later commentators, it must be acknowledged that we do not know what the *author* of the Syriac Diatessaron had in mind, when he rendered the Greek text αὐτὸ (or: αὐτόν?) οὐ κατέλαβεν into Syriac, for one cannot intuit how he understood the ambiguous verb ܐܕܪܟ from the later interpretations of the fourth century interpreters Ephraem and Aphrahat.[86]

Conclusion

The text of Jn 1:5 in the *Oration*, where Tatian quotes the verse with two *present* tenses (φαίνει...καταλαμβάνει) and the *Diatessaron*, where he quotes this verse with two past tenses (ܡܢܗܪ ܗܘܐ ... ܐܕܪܟ), occasions the question which Greek text Tatian had before him. In the discussion

of the text in the *Oration* the conclusion was that there is reason to assume that his text was καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν. The use of καταλαμβάνει in his reference was, just as was the case with Clement, due to the specific application which he made in an 'anthropological' discussion on the soul. In the *Diatessaron* Tatian clearly rendered κατέλαβεν. Does the reading 'was shining' ('shone') imply that he read ἐφάνη in his text? There is no reason to assume this. Jn 1:1-5 was the opening of the Diatessaron in which the historical life of Jesus was presented in the form of a harmony. It is the history of the One who is the Logos and the Light which was in the world—and the world did not accept Him—and who came to his own—and his own did not receive Him—since He was the Word that had become a body and had lived among men. Tatian, in his historical account, assimilated the present tense (φαίνει) to the past tense (κατέλαβεν) to emphasize the historical character of the message of Jesus. In other words, there is no reason to suppose that he had before him a text of John 1:5 different from the text which we read in the majority of our manuscripts:[87]

καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν.

NOTES

[1] Cf. Tatian, *Orat.*, 29,1f.; J.C.Th. Otto, *Tatiani Oratio ad Graecos*, Jena 1851, 114; Ed. Schwartz, *Tatiani Oratio ad Graecos*, Leipzig 1888, 30. Cf. M. Elze, *Tatian und seine Theologie*, Göttingen 1960, 22f. 28; U. Neymeyr, *Die christlichen Lehrer im zweiten Jahrhundert*, Leiden-New York a.o., 1989, 182-195 (6.3 Tatian), 182f.

[2] R.M. Grant, Tatian and the Bible, *Studia Patristica* I, TU 63, Berlin 1957, 297-306, esp. 297; cf. already J.B. Lightfoot, *Essays on the Work entitled Supernatural Religion*, London 1889, 275.

[3] Lightfoot, *o.c.*, 275.

[4] Éd. Massaux, Tatian, in: *idem, Influence de Saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant Saint Irénée*, Louvain-Gembloux 1950, 571-576, 571: 'Il n'y a en cela rien d'étonnant: son œuvre étant avant tout polémique, il utilise des arguments qui peuvent boucher le monde païen; il est pour lors normal qu'il n'accorde pas grande place à l'Écriture'.

[5] C.F. Hawthorne, Tatian and his Discourse to the Greeks, *Harvard Theological Review* 57 (1964), 161-188, 182.

[6] Tatian, *Orat.*, 30; Schwartz, *Oratio*, 30:25ff.

[7] Cf. M. Whittaker, *Tatian, Oratio ad Graecos and Fragments*, Oxford 1982, xviisq.

[8] Hawthorne, Tatian, 182-184, lists 21 passages, of which only three are indicated as direct quotations: Ps 8:6; Jn 1:5 and 4:24; Whittaker, *Tatian*, xvii, registers for the OT 2 quotations and 5 allusions, for the NT 10 quotations and 24 allusions. Part of them, however, can only be called 'biblical language'.

[9] Cf. a.o. the lists in H.A. Daniel, *Tatianus, der Apologet*, Halle 1837, 137f. (15 words or expressions); Schwartz, *Oratio*, Index, notes 37 words (with a †) as belonging to biblical language, to which one might be able to add another dozen.

[10] Hawthorne, Tatian, 184; cf. 186 "the only reference to the Synoptics is a possible allusion to Mt. 13:44"; B.F. Westcott, *A general Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament*, London ⁴1875, 317, speaks of a *clear* reference 'to a parable recorded by St Matthew'. Cf. Grant, Tatian and the Bible, 299; see, however, the attempt of the anonymous author of *Supernatural Religion* II, London (rev.ed.) 1879, 147f. to show that there is no reason to connect the text with Matthew.

[11] Strongly denied by the anonymous author of *Supernatural Religion*, 146f.

[12] Lightfoot, *Essays*, 275: "As regards our Synoptical Gospels, the indications in Tatian's Apology are not such that we can lay much stress on them". Similar W. Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century*, London 1876, 238.

[13] H. Olshausen, *Die Echtheit der vier canonischen Evangelien, Ein Versuch*, Königsberg 1823. 337f.

[14] A. Resch, *Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien* III (heft 4), Leipzig 1896, 49f.; Massaux, *Influence*, 574: "Peut-être une reminiscence de Jn I.1"; cf. Sanday, *Gospels*, 304; Westcott, *Survey*, 317, n. 2 [adding that this reference is not certain]; contra: *Supernatural Religion*, 372-375.

[15] Daniel, *Tatian*, 134 ("von allen Seiten anerkannt"); Sandy, *Gospels*, 305f.; Westcott, *Survey*, l.c.; Lightfoot, *Essays*, 276; Resch, *Paralleltexte*, 51f. ("Ebenso wenig...zu bezweifeln"); C. Tischendorf, *Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verfasst?*, Leipzig ⁴1866, 17 ("unzweifelhaft"); Massaux, *Influence*, 574, "une citation quasi littérale".

[16] Resch, *Paralleltexte*, 55f.; Massaux, *Influence*, 574, "il dépend certainement de Jn., I.9". Cf. also 1:4.

[17] Cf. F. Barth, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Gütersloh 1908, 285; H.J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Freiburg ³1892, 108 ("...während der johanneische Prolog schon als Autorität citirt wird"); cf. Grant, Tatian and the Bible, 303.

[18] Daniel, *Tatianus*, 134; Resch, *Paralleltexte*, 92ff.; Lightfoot, *Essays*, 275f.; Massaux, *Influence*, 574: "allusion...peut-être pense-t-il aux mots de Jn., iv.24". Contra: *Supernatural Religion* II, 377f.

[19] Massaux, *Influence*, 574 ("une dépendance indéniable"); Westcott, *Survey*, 317 (116f.); cf. Lightfoot, *Essays*, 277, speaking of a 'decisive' testimony to the fourth Gospel; R.M. Grant, *Greek Apologists of the Second Century*, London 1988, 128: "Tatian certainly used the Gospel of John".

[20] K.G. Bretschneider, *Probabilia de evangelii et epistolarum Joannis Apostoli indole et origine*, Leipzig 1820, 195.

[21] *Supernatural Religion* II, 372-378.

[22] Th. Zahn, *Tatians Diatessaron*, FGNK 1, Erlangen 1881.

[23] So already Lightfoot, *Essays*, 275.

[24] Schwartz, *Oratio*, 14:10-21; Otto, *Oratio*, 58:6-62:1.

[25] Lit. 'in immortality'; translators connect it with 'punishment' or 'death'; I would prefer to connect it with λαμβανοῦσα.

[26] This looks like a pun on 1 Jn 1:5, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς φῶς ἐστιν καὶ σκοτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδεμία. As far as I can see, this suggestion has not been made yet; it would suggest that Tatian knew the first letter of John as well.

[27] R.C. Kukula, *Tatians Rede an die Bekenner des Griechentums*, BKV I, Kempten-München 1913, 175-257, 241 may be correct, when he interprets ἔσωσεν, ἐσώθη, κατέλαβεν as gnomic aorists.

[28] Mss. MV: κατέλαβεν ἡ λόγος μέν ἐστι τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ φῶς, σκότος δὲ κτλ. Instead of ἡ there is in P a *varia lectio* ἥ; several translators guess ἤ, cf. Otto, *Oratio*, 61 ('sane logos quidem est divina lux'), who also mentions the fact that copyists and editors have changed it into ὁ which they connected with λόγος: cf. H.U. Meyboom, *De Apologeten* II, *Tatianus en Athenagoras*, Leiden 1910, 27; J.E. Ryland, Address of Tatian to the Greeks, *ANF* II, [Repr.] Grand Rapids 1975, 70; Kukula, *Tatians Rede*, 41 interprets it as 'wobei der Logos als das von Gott ausgehende Licht...zu verstehen ist'; cf. D. Ruiz Bueono, *Padres Apologistas Griegos* (s.II), Madrid 1954, 590, 'en el sentido que el Verbo es la luz de Dios'; M. Whittaker, *Tatian*, 27, renders 'in that'; Dr. J. den Boeft, in a letter (23th of June 1992), is inclined to render 'in so far as'. Still I would take ἡ as meaning 'for which', that is, 'for the soul for which', since (μέν...δέ) two types of soul are contrasted here.

[29] Bretschneider, *Probabilia*, 195; *Supernatural Religion* II, 376.

[30] Cf. Lightfoot, *Essays*, 276, who refers to Lk 2:24, Acts 2:16; 13:40; Rom. 4:18.

[31] Cf. Olshausen, *Echtheit*, 338; A. Jülicher, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, $^{5.6}$1906, 446: "ein Wort aus dem Johannesprolog I 5 wird von ihm aufs feierlichste...angeführt"; J. Leipoldt, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* I, Leipzig 1907, 131: "diese Formel ist zweifellos synonym mit der andreren: das, was geschrieben steht".

[32] Olshausen, *Echtheit*, 338.

[33] See for the connection with ἡ above, n. 28.

[34] One may wonder whether the source text of Tatian read with B* merely τὸ φῶς, 'the light', which he interpreted as the light of God.

[35] *Oration* 13; Schwartz, *Oratio*, 15:5f., τὸν διάκονον τοῦ πεπονθότος θεοῦ.

[36] *Orat.* 13:3; Schwartz, *Oratio*, 15:5-7.

[37] *Orat.* 14:1; Schwartz, *Oratio*, 15:7.

[38] Grant, Tatian and the Bible, 298; *idem, Greek Apologists*, 128.

[39] Elze, *Tatian*, 83, 94: I do not agree with Elze's remark, 'So wird der Bezug auf ein einmaliges heilsgeschichliches Datum getilgt': it does not do justice to the fact that John describes the divine act of 'salvation history' not as a once-only fact, but as everlasting (φαίνει, present tense), whereas the reaction of mankind is presented in the aorist, which if it is not to be taken as complexive or gnomic denotes a (*un*heilsgeschichtlich) fact.

[40] Resch, *Paralleltexte*, 54.

[41] L. Leloir, *Le témoignage d'Éphrem sur le Diatessaron*, CSCO 227, Subs. 19, Louvain 1962, 74-77, esp. 76f.

[42] *Orat.* 13:3; Schwartz, *Oratio*, 15:4f.

[43] Elze, *Tatian*, 83, "begreift nicht".

[44] Resch, *Paralleltexte*, 52f.; H. Kutter, *Clemens Alexandrinus und das Neue Testament*, Giessen 1897, 34; M. Barnard, *Clement of Alexandria's Biblical Text*, T & S V:5, Cambridge 1899, 52; M. Mees, *Die Zitate aus dem Neuen Testament bei Clemens von Alexandrien*, I-II (QVC 2), Bari 1970, I, 88f., II, 91.

[45] H.-I. Marrou-M. Harl, *Clément d'Alexandrie, Le Pédagogue*, Livre I, SC 70, Paris 1960, 162:13f.

[46] Cl. Mondésert-H.-I. Marrou, *Clément d'Alexandrie, Le Pédagogue*, Livre II, SC 108, Paris 1965, 158:11.

[47] Mondésert-Marrou, *o.c.*, 190:2.

[48] Barnard, *Clement*, 52, who adduces 'H 13 and four other cursives' (on the basis of Tischendorf's *Octava*); he also quotes the reading of Old Latin *e*: 'et tenebrae eum non conprae | Eum non conpraehenderunt' with the comment: 'the reading of the archetype

of *e* is then doubly certain'. Von Soden does not mention Clement (I^{hc368} K^{i88} af a q), but mentions the *Excerpta ex Theodoto* (Θδοτ); Souter, however, registers Clement (Clem 2/3) among the witnesses, and so does Mees, *Zitate*, II,91 ($K\lambda^{pl}$ 13 e, q).

[49] *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, 8:4; O. Stählin, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, III, 108:29; Mees, *Zitate*, II. 91.

[50] Incorrectly, Mees (*Zitate*, I,89) attributes the reading αὐτόν to the fact that Clement referred to the Logos here: 'Einige wenige (sc. Mss.) und manchmal (*sic*) auch Clemens müssen aber genauer herausarbeiten, dass es sich um den im Vorausgehenden verkündeten Logos handelt...'; what may be true for the Mss. is not true for Clement. Only the *Excerpta ex Theodoto* (F. Sagnard, *Clément d'Alexandrie, Extraits de Théodote*, SC, Paris 1948, 74:1-8, esp.5, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸν οὐ κατέλαβεν, identify αὐτόν as the Logos, who is the Light (οὗτος ἐστι τὸ φῶς), whom the apostates and others did not recognize (οὐκ ἔγνωσαν αὐτόν) and whom Death could not detain (οὐ κατέσχεν αὐτόν), apparently taking καταλαμβάνω also with two different meanings.

[51] Resch, *Paralleltexte*, 54.

[52] Barnard, *Clement*, 53 ad 1:5.

[53] Kutter, *Clemens*, 34.

[54] Mees, *Zitate*, I, 88: "Damit wird anders als beim Evangelisten den Kampf zwischen Licht und Finsternis für die Dauer dieser Weltzeit herausgestellt". When Mees adds to it: "und das Unvermögen betont, das Licht aufzunehmen" he misreads the texts in question: Clement wants to emphasize that the illuminated will not be bereft of the light that is in him in this world already, as long as he is not light himself. So Clement says that the darkness does not do harm to the true believer who has knowledge.

[55] Th. Zahn, *Tatians Diatessaron*, 113f.

[56] J.-B. Aucher-G. Moesinger, *Evangelii Concordantis Expositio facta a Sancto Ephraemo Doctore Syro*, Venice 1876; for Jn 1:5, cf. *ibid.*, 5:27f. (lines a and b); 6:19f. (line b), 6:23f. (line b).

[57] Cf. T. Baarda, *The Gospel Quotations of Aphrahat, the Persian Sage*, I. *Aphrahat's Text of the Fourth Gospel*, Amsterdam 1975, 61f., a reconstruction based on five quotations or allusions.

[58] J. Hamlyn Hill, *The Earliest Life of Christ ever compiled from the Four Gospels, being the Diatessaron of Tatian*, Edinburgh 1894, 334; *idem*, *A Dissertation on the Gospel Commentary of S. Ephraem the Syrian*, Edinburgh 1896, 76.

[59] Hill, *Earliest Life*, 333.

[60] Hill, *Earliest Life*, 41, *idem*, ²1910, 1: for the Arabic text, cf. A. Ciasca, *Tatiani Evangeliorum Harmoniae Arabice*, Rome 1888, 1 (Arab), 1 (Latin: *lucet*); A.-S. Marmardji, *Diatessaron de Tatien, Texte arabe*, Beyrut 1935, 2 (French, 3: *luit*).

[61] H.W. Hogg, The Diatessaron of Tatian, in: *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* X, repr. Grand Rapids [1969], 43.

[62] E. Preuschen-A. Pott, *Tatians Diatessaron aus dem Arabischen übersetzt*, Heidelberg 1926, 61.

[63] The Arabic verb (درك IV) has all the connotations that we have in Syriac: "to reach, attain, anticipate, get hold of, recognize, understand".

[64] L. Leloir, *Saint Éphrem, Commentaire de l'Évangile concordant, Version arménienne*, CSCO 137, Arm. 1, Louvain 1953, 5:18f. (=I,6); 5:21 (=I,7) with **ասէ** ('quoth'); 5:24-26 (=I,7); translation: *idem*, *idem*, CSCO 145, Arm. 2, Louvain 1954, 4:20f., 23, 25f.

[65] L. Leloir, *ibid.*, 5:19 (=I,6); 6:18f. (=I,7); 6:14-16 (=I,7) with omission of *eam* in Ms.B.

[66] L. Leloir, *Saint Éphrem, Commentaire de l'Évangile concordant, Texte syriaque* (Ms. Chester Beatty 709), Dublin 1963, 6:4 (=I,6) lines a-b; 6:6 (=I,7), line with ܐܡܪ, 'quoth'; 6:8 (=I,7), line a; 6:18f. (=I,7), lines a-b, without eam (cf. Arm. Ms. B); 6:20 (=I,7), line b. See for a recent discussion of the text, E. Beck, Der syrische Diatessaronkommentar zu Jo.I 1-5, *Oriens Christianus* 67 (1983), 1-31, esp. 17-19.

[67] Leloir, *Témoignage*, 12, with the variants of the Armenian *vicerunt eam* (Ms. A 3/3; Ms. B 2/3; victae sunt Ms.B 1/3).

[68] I. Ortiz de Urbina, *Vetus Evangelium Syrorum et exinde excerptum Diatessaron Tatiani*, Madrid 1967, 207, based on Aphrahat (5, nr. 27-28) and Ephraem (nr. 29); the omission of the initial ܘ = *et* due to Aphrahat's text. In his rendering he does not give an equivalent of ܕܢ: 'Era luz resplandeciente...'.

[69] J. Molitor, Tatians Diatessaron und seine Verhältnis zur altsyrischen und altgeorgischen Überlieferung, *Oriens Christianus* 53 (1969), 1-88, 3: <Ipsa> lux in tenbris (sg.) illucens erat...', indicating that *Ipsa* should not be rendered for the sake of a better translation; he follows Ortiz de Urbina in the omission of the initial *et*.

[70] This is the translation of Leloir, which has been adopted by Beck, Diatessaronkommentar, 17: "et lux in tenebris lucebat (!) et tenebrae eam non comprehenderunt", apparently laying stress on the past tense; he even writes, *ibid.*, 20: "Der Kommentar engt also auf Grund seines Imperfekts (lucebat) die Finsternis eine auf die Zeit (...)"; however, the imperfect tense is only valid for the Latin translation which he gives, not for the conjugatio periphrastica of the Syriac text which has participle with perfect 'erat'. I prefer the periphrastic form, since the Syriac idiom also had the competence to use a perfect tense as it does in 1:5b; one cannot exclude the possibility that the translator wished to differentiate here in his rendering of the verbs in 1:5a and 1:5b.

[71] Leloir, *Saint Éphrem, Commentaire* (Syr.), 6:8f.

[72] A modern example is found in J.H. Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St John*. I, Edinburg 1928, 5: 'Jn. does not say "the Light *shone*', but 'the Light *shines*'...".

[73] S. Lyonnet, *Les origines de la version arménienne et le Diatessaron*, Rome 1950, 46.

[74] Lyonnet, *Origines*, 46, 123, 124f., 133; for the text see G. Lafontaine, *Version arménienne des œuvres d'Aphraate le Syrien* I, CSCO 383, Arm.8, 11:12 [=I:11].

[75] There is no reason to assume a reading ἐνίκησεν as Mees, *Zitate*, II, 9, suggests (while he refers to Diat/a Aphr. arm, that is, the Armenian versions of both Ephraem and Aphrahat).

[76] Zohrab, 183; Lyonnet, *Origines*, 46.

[77] Lafontaine, *Version arménienne*, 9:12 [=I:10]; cf. Lyonnet, *Origines*, 123.

[78] Lafontaine, *Version arménienne* (...), III, CSCO 424, Arm. 12, Louvain 1980, 88:1-3 (*Dem.*XV:7, =Syr. XVI:8); Lyonnet, *Origines*, 123. The Syriac text of Aphrahat does not have verse 5b.

[79] Lyonnet, *Origines*, 124-126; cf. Leloir, *Témoignage*, 75.

[80] F. Baethgen, *Evangelienfragmente*, Leipzig 1885, 65: 'Jo 1,5 (Zahn § 1,11) ist als Text des T(atian) gesichert (...) '...*vicerunt*'; für *vicerunt* hat A(phrahat) zwei mal mit PSc *comprehenderunt* (אדרכה). Hier lag also bei T(atian) offenbar eine anderer Übersetzung vor als die, welche A(phrahat) befolgte, denn ארך ist nie=vicit'; Baethgen suggests (n. 2) a verb זכיהי or חסנה. Cf. Lyonnet, *Origines*, 126, n.1.

[81] Leloir, *Témoignage*, 242, cf. 74-76; cf. Beck, Diatessaronkommentar, 18; see also Leloir, *Saint Éphrem, Commentaire* (Syr.), 7, note 6 ad Jn 1:5, where he expresses his hesitation about *comprehenderunt*. It is not necessary to enter into the discussion between Lyonnet and Leloir here. For it is clear now what the Syriac text of Ephraem and of the Diatessaron reads, namely [illegible]. This just as its Greek counterpart κατέλαβεν, has sort of an ambiguity that occasioned the different applications in the texts of Ephraem and Aphrahat that both Leloir and Beck discovered and used for their evaluation of the verb.

[82] It is to be noticed that Beck, Diatessaronkommentar, 18 agrees with Leloir in finding in Ephraem's Syriac commentary text the meaning '(gewaltsam) ergreifen, in die Gewalt bekommen, ...bezwingen', but then—in my view—correctly writes, 'Ganz auffällig ist es nun, daß der gleiche Kommentar unmittelbar an das Zitat ganz klar die andre Bedeutung des...(*adrek*) anfügt', by referring to Jn 1:11.

[83] Beck, Diatessaronkommentar, 19.

[84] Beck, Diatessaronkommentar, 19, "Er stellt die 'griechische' Deutung dem Zitat voran und erklärt es anschliessend auf die semitische Art eines Aphraat".

[85] Beck, Diatessaronkommentar, 19, "Dabei scheint er die Widersprüchlichkeit der zwei Erklärungen gar nicht erkannt zu haben.... Eine solche geistige Kurzsichtigkeit möchte ich Ephräm nicht zutrauen".

[86] The verb may mean 'come up to', 'be on the trace of', 'overtake', 'overcome', 'seize', 'obtain', 'apprehend' and 'comprehend' in the sense of 'understand', cf. J. Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*, Oxford 1903, 97; it shares all the variations of the meaning of καταλαμβάνειν, cf. R. Payne Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus*, I, Oxford [1879-1901], repr. Hildesheim 1981, 949f.

[87] It is true that the first half of the verse is not found in the *Oratio*, but since there is no variant reading of the first halve of the verse in Greek textual tradition we may assume that this was his text of John 1:5.

Vrije Universiteit, De Boelelaan 1105, 1081 HV *Amsterdam*

Vigiliae Christianae 47 (1993), 226-233, E. J. Brill, Leiden

IGNATIUS TO THE ROMANS 2:1c

BY

CULLEN I. K. STORY

Approximately in the year A.D. 108, Roman authorities forcibly removed Ignatius from his post as bishop of the church in Antioch of Syria, taking him in chains to Rome to face martyrdom in the Roman arena. During his forced journey, Ignatius was able to visit the churches of Philadelphia and Smyrna in the province of Asia, receiving delegations as well from three other churches—Ephesus, Magnesia, and Tralles. Ignatius wrote to all five churches and, in addition, he sent a letter to the church at Rome and also a semi-personal letter to Polycarp, bishop of the church of Smyrna. All seven letters are extant today, thereby enriching our Christian heritage. My main concern is with the letter to the church at Rome. Similar to Paul's letter to the same church fifty years earlier, Ignatius writes to Christians whom he had not previously known but whom he hopes soon to see. He speaks quite openly of his anticipated struggle with wild beasts in the Roman arena (Rom 5:2, cf. Eph 1:2[1]), a fate which he views as both his destined lot (κλῆρος — Rom 1:2, cf. Trall 12:3; Philad 5:1) and the will of God (Rom 2:2). Therefore, he requests the Christians in Rome not to intercede with the ruling authorities to secure his release (Rom 4:1-2). The request startles the serious reader and yet, at the same time here and there, the letter appears to raise the haunting question: as he arrives at Rome, will Ignatius stand firm in his purpose or will he flinch in fear before his impending fate? In answer, the bishop of Antioch reveals uncommon candor and frankness as he writes, "Even if, when I am present (with you), I plead with you [i.e. "intercede for me"], do not be persuaded by me; be persuaded much more by the things which I am (now) writing to you" (Rom 7:2). What an honest, personal assessment coming from a stalwart seasoned Christian!

Over against this brief descriptive background, my essay aims to understand the third sentence of Rom 2:1 (= Rom 2:1c). The printed texts of J. B. Lightfoot,[2] G. Bosio,[3] and K. Bihlmeyer[4]—based on versional evidence—have produced the following reading:

ἐὰν γὰρ σιωπήσητε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ἐγὼ λόγος θεοῦ·
ἐὰν δὲ ἐρασθῆτε τῆς σαρκός μου, πάλιν ἔσομαι φωνή.
"For, if ye be silent and leave me alone, I am a word of God;
but if ye desire my flesh, then shall I be again a mere cry."[5]

While the alternation between *logos* and *phōnē* is common to all the versions, the question remains as to whether—in the first apodosis—the future form γενήσομαι is to be read with manuscripts S Sm (cf. also Zahn's text[6] and Schoedel's translation[7]) or to be omitted with manuscripts L (Am) C (cf. the texts of Lightfoot and Bihlmeyer). On the surface at least, a future form in the first apodosis corresponds fittingly with the uncontested future ἔσομαι in the second apodosis. The difference between the readings, apparently, is between a future and a present reality. "I shall be a word of God" suggests the new life of the bishop after his martyrdom in the presence of the living God. "I am a word of God" implies an "incarnation" of that word in the actual martyrdom of the bishop. In either case, only the resolute silence of the church in behalf of Ignatius can allow the event to happen.

But from the versional reading, it is the alternation between (or the distinction of) λόγος and φωνή which claims our attention. Lightfoot affirms that the *logos* of God is the manifestation of the Divine purpose in the martyrdom of Ignatius. Should that purpose be thwarted by an untimely intercession of the church, the Divine plan "will be reduced to a mere inarticulate meaningless cry."[8] An appeal is made to philosophical literature (Aristotle, Plato, Plutarch) and to Christian theologians (Melito, Origen, John the Monk and others) where a clear distinction is made between λόγος and φωνή.[9] There is, however, obvious unevenness in the sources cited. For example, although Origen[10] accepts the distinction between Jesus the Λόγος (John 1:1) and John the φωνή (John 1:23), John's "voice" is certainly no "inarticulate meaningless cry" or "irrational cry", as he announces the Coming One. As for John the Monk (4th century), after quoting the text of Rom 2:1c as the versions render it, his lengthy excursus reveals no less than three distinct ideas behind the alternation of λόγος and φωνή. First, he implies that "I shall be a word of God" refers to the world to come for while the saints of God are in the world, they are "men of the Voice; but after they are gone out of the world of the Voice they will be men of the Word and not of the Voice".[11] Second, however, John the Monk affirms that the λόγος and the φωνή are mixed together in the human being—"as the soul is mixed with the body, the Word is mixed with the Voice."[12] And third,

the Voice "is the interpreter of the Word,"[13] quite a different emphasis from either of the two preceding ideas. In order to appeal to John the Monk for a true exposition of Rom 2:1c—as Lightfoot does[14]—one must be conscious of the different nuances of meaning which John the Monk gives to the λόγος-φωνή parallelism. At any rate, the opening lines of John's exposition to fellow monks indicate that the saints of God are "men of the Voice"—here and now—but "men of the Word" upon their departure from this world.[15]

But now, attractive though the versional reading may be and enjoying as it does wide-spread support among translators,[16] the basic question has to be: does Ignatius "buy into" a distinction between λόγος and φωνή such as the versional reading implies? What does an investigation of the two concepts in his letters reveal? In three references, *logos* refers to the Divine message (Philad 11:1; Smyr intro, and 10:1), once (Philad 11:2) it means "account" or "mark" (of honor), once (Eph 15:2) it is used in the weighty claim, "the one who truly possesses the word of Jesus," and there is one lone reference to Jesus as the *logos* of God (Magn 8:2). It is important to note that all references are *objective* in nature, quite distinct from the *subjective* claim in the versional reading of Rom 2:1c, "I am a word of God" or "I shall be a word of God." As for the other term, φωνή, it is found in two texts only. In one of the occurrences (Eph 4:2), Ignatius quite simply urges the Ephesian Christians to sing with one *voice* to God. A much more important use occurs in Philad 7:1-2 where Ignatius—writing back to the church from Troas—reminisces on a controversy that he had experienced during his stay in Philadelphia. He remembers that his opponents were caught in the web of divisions and he recalls what message he gave at that time and what motivated him to give it. "When I was among you, I cried out, I was speaking with a great *voice*, with the *voice* of God [italics are mine], 'Give heed to the bishop and to the presbytery and deacons' " (Philad 7:1). Certain ones, however, reasoned that Ignatius had issued this caveat because of advance information that he had received concerning divisions among them. Ignatius denied the charge, affirming to the contrary that "The Spirit was proclaiming (these things)" (Philad 7:2). Thus he claims that the "great voice" with which he spoke at that critical time was none other than the voice of God or the voice of the Spirit of God. The question can now be asked: is it conceivable that in two crucial texts, Ignatius uses *voice* in one text to relate to his flesh (Rom 2:1c, versional text), and in the other text, to the Spirit (Philad 7:1-2)? Conceivable perhaps, but not likely.

With due respect to the "versional" text and to the scholars who accept it, my essay maintains that the Greek text is in full accord with the thought of Ignatius,[17] reading as follows:

> ἐὰν γὰρ σιωπήσητε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ἐγὼ γενήσομαι θεοῦ·
> ἐὰν δὲ ἐρασθῆτε τῆς σαρκός μου, πάλιν ἔσομαι τρέχων·
> "For if you are silent about me, I shall be God's [i.e. belong to God]; but if you love my flesh, I shall be running again."

(1) *The first conditional sentence.* The apodosis of the sentence, i.e. "I shall be God's," is similar to the claim which Paul makes in behalf of the Corinthian church, "And you are Christ's and Christ is God's" (1 Cor 3:23), a claim which Paul makes personally according to 2 Cor 10:7. The confession of Ignatius is sustained by other texts in his letters—Rom 6:2—"the one who desires to be God's," Rom 7:1—"become much more mine, that is to say, God's," Eph 8:1—"since you are wholly God's," Philad 3:2a—"For as many as are God's and Jesus Christ's," and 3:2b—"these shall be God's." In a different vein, the text of Rom 4:1 reads, ἄφετέ με θηρίων εἶναι, "permit me to be the wild beasts' ", concerning which Lightfoot remarks, "The opposition between θηρίων and θεοῦ is studied. He must first be the wild beasts', that in the end he may be God's,"[18] a strong corroboration—so it seems to me—of the Greek text of Rom 2:1c, "I shall be God's." The fact that the present or the future tense of εἰμί or γίνομαι may be used in the expression says that the Divine possession of Ignatius or of Christians—as the case may be—contains a present, no less than a future, reality. And yet Ignatius' words imply that his approaching martyrdom will mark the full possession by God of the one who belongs to God, an idea that is parallel to another favorite expression of the martyr, ἐπιτυχεῖν θεοῦ, "to attain unto God" (Eph 12:2; Magn 14; Trall 12:2, *et al.*). Both expressions are, for certain, as far removed from the idea of apotheosis or deification as east is from west. Indeed, Ignatius affirms that the one who is given to God as a pure loaf of Christ (4:1) or libation (2:2) or sacrifice (4:2) is the one who shall be God's to the fullest degree of that claim.

(2) *The second conditional sentence.* The translation, "But if you love my flesh, I shall again be running," pictures Ignatius facing the awesome possibility that his path to martyrdom may be stymied if the church makes an untimely and unfortunate intercession on his behalf to Roman civil authorities. To be "running again" suggests the metaphor

of the race in which Ignatius has already been engaged—from Antioch to Rome—a race that is implicit in the context seeing that it is God who has transferred him from the east to the west, a course which ends, Ignatius maintains, at the sacrificial altar (*θυσιαστήριον*, Rom 2:2). It is the path that the apostle Paul once travelled and Ignatius hopes that he will be found under the apostle's footsteps (Eph 12:2).

It is precisely the metaphor of the martyr's race that John Chrysostom highlights in a fascinating address or *ἐγκώμιον* (encomium) in praise of Ignatius. The address was delivered by Chrysostom when he was spiritual leader and writer in Ignatius' own beloved Antioch.[19] In general, says Chrysostom, martyrs are those who run the race *of* godliness (col 587) and *toward* godliness (col 592). "From our city [Antioch] to Rome," says Chrysostom, Ignatius pioneered a course (*δρόμος*) through unchartered terrain, a path that was doubly difficult due to the distance travelled and to the time required to cover that distance (cols 590, 592). The rugged course, he adds, was part of the devil's strategm by which he intended to break the spirit of the martyr. The plot failed, however, for the devil did not realize that Ignatius had Jesus as his travelling companion (*συνέμπορος*). Moreover, the churches along the path of the martyr would "run together from every side to anoint [cf. Eph 3:1] the athlete [Ignatius] as he was running with such eagerness to his death" (col 592). The sustained terminology of the race is quite remarkable. As a further interpretation and development of Rom 2:1c—2:2, Chrysostom compares Ignatius' trek from east to west to the trajectory of the sun (Rom 2:2, cf. Chrysostom, col 595). Both the sun and Ignatius run the same course in the natural world. Then, at once, the comparison turns into contrast. The sun above was running toward the west carrying a physical or practical light (*αἰσθητὸν φῶς*) but Ignatius below was reflecting a spiritual light of teaching. The two imperfects (*ἔτρεχεν* and *ἀντέλαμπε*), referring respectively to the sun and the martyr, are probably "progressive" in nuance, revealing the contrasting effect of the two lights all along their respective journeys. The light of Ignatius' teaching is not innate like the light of the sun but rather it is a light reflected from Christ (cf. 2 Cor 4:6), bringing inspiration to mortals (*ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἐνιείς*). In a tactful way, the two are further contrasted as they come to the "finish line," where Chrysostom enlists first the present tense to depict what happens daily in the sun's race. "That one (the sun) as it departs to the western parts hides itself and immediately brings on the night" (col 592). The portrayal of Ignatius'

arrival, however, requires the aorist tense since his race was a one-time experience. "But this one (Ignatius), after arriving in the western parts arose from thence more radiantly, having conferred the greatest benefits upon all those [i.e. the churches of Asia] along the way" (col 592). The verb ἀνατέλλω in both Rom 2:2 and Chrysostom's encomium undoubtedly refers to the new life of the martyr with God after the martyr's death. His martyrdom meant that he departed from the world with the goal in view of rising unto God (Rom 2:2).

Conclusion. We have seen that numerous texts in the letters of Ignatius support the apodosis of the Greek text of the first conditional sentence in Rom 2:1c, i.e. "I shall be God's." The words represent the confident claim of Ignatius that, through martyrdom, God will receive him and possess him completely. As for the Greek text of the second conditional sentence, both the nearer and larger context support the fearful apodosis, "I shall be running again." That is to say, if the church effects his release, he will re-enter upon his "race" in the world. In contrast to that alarming possibility, the bishop of Antioch senses that his course from east to west will have crossed the finish line in Rome. Accordingly, the church is not to engage in petition for his release but to form a choir and to sing praise to God for having summoned Ignatius to the end of his course (Rom 2:2). Any attempt by the church to enter Ignatius in a new race can only come from the flesh not from the Spirit (Rom 2:1c). As to the larger context, it is entirely possible that some members of the church at Rome actually would envision a more brilliant future for Ignatius in far-off places on earth—if only they would be able to secure his release from his chains and impending death. Such a possibility apparently lies behind the strong protestation of the martyr in Rom 6:1-3. In no uncertain terms, he states that it is better for him to die to Jesus Christ than to rule over the ends of the earth. Thus he pleads with the church to permit him to be "an imitator of the passion of my God" (6:3).

In brief, given the nearer and larger context, the Greek reading of Rom 2:1c is entirely appropriate. The bishop of Antioch has finished his δρόμος "course" (cf. 2 Tim 4:7). In no way does he desire to run "again" in another race seeing that martyrdom in Rome is his Divinely-appointed lot whereby he shall be fully owned by God.

One question remains. I am quite convinced that the versional reading of Rom 2:1c is secondary, but if so, what may be its origin? If indeed

logos and *phōnē* are employed by the versions in Rom 2:1c in a way that is contrary to Ignatian usage, how did this unusual reading begin? It is possible that the reading may have originated from Magn 8:2 where Jesus is described as the Word who came forth from God's silence.

> From the silence of God, Jesus comes forth as the Word of God (Magn 8:2)
> From the silence of the church, Ignatius becomes a Word of God (Rom 2:1c-versional text)

Moreover, it may be that sophisticated Syriac and Armenian translators, failing to understand the meaning of the Greek text of Rom 2:1c, reached back into the Aristotelian distinction between λόγος and φωνή and introduced these very words in their equivalent translation into the margin of their respective translations. Whereupon, later transcribers took the final step of making the marginal reading of those very translations (exemplars) from which they were copying to become the textual reading of their own transcribed texts. Conceivable? Perhaps. Otherwise, it seems to me that the origin of the versional reading remains a mystery.

NOTES

[1] With the exception of New Testament references to John, 1-2 Corinthians, and 2 Timothy, all textual references in this essay pertain to the Ignatian letters. Hence, e.g., references to Rom (=Romans) and to Eph (=Ephesians) denote the letters of Ignatius to those churches, *not the New Testament letters.*

[2] *Apostolic Fathers*, Part II, S. Ignatius, S. Polycarp, vol. II, sect. 1; London: MacMillan & Co., 1885, pp. 198-200.

[3] *I Padri Apostolici*, Parte II; Torino, Italy: Società Editrice Internazionale, 1942.

[4] *Die Apostolischen Väter: Neubearbeitung der Funkschen Ausgabe*, 2nd ed., W. Schneemelcher: Tübingen: Mohr, 1956.

[5] Lightfoot, p. 555. The versional evidence is as follows: the Latin version (L) based on two manuscripts, Caiensis and Montacutianus; the short recension of the Syriac (S)—a manuscript containing only the letters of Ignatius to Polycarp, to the Ephesians, and to the Romans; the Syriac version of Romans in the accounts of Ignatius' martyrdom (Sm); the Coptic version (C); the Armenian version (A); the Arabic version. In addition to these manuscripts, there is an early interpretation of Rom 2:1c by John the Monk (4th century), the Syriac text of which with English translation is to be found in William Cureton, *Corpus Ignatianum*, London: Francis & John Rivington, 1849.

[6] *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*, ed. Gebhardt, Harnack, and Zahn, Lipsiae: J. C. Hinrichs, 1906, p. 101.

[7] W. R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985, p. 170.

[8] Lightfoot, p. 198.

[9] Lightfoot, pp. 198-200.

[10] *The Commentary of Origen on S. John's Gospel*, ed. A. E. Brooke, Cambridge: University Press, 1896, Vol 1, p. 99.

[11] Cureton, p. 239.

[12] Cureton, p. 241.

[13] Cureton, p. 242.

[14] Lightfoot, pp. 199-200.

[15] Cureton, p. 239.

[16] Compare E. J. Goodspeed, *The Apostolic Fathers, An American Translation* (1950)—"For if you are silent and let me alone, I will be a word of God; but if you are in love with my body, I will be just a voice again." Cf. also the translations of R. M. Grant (1950), M. Staniforth (1968), J. N. Sparks (1978), and W. R. Schoedel (1985).

[17] The evidence for the Greek text is as follows: Codex Parisiensis—Colbertinus (G), 10th-11th cent.; Cod. Hierosolymitanus (H), 10th cent.; Cod. Sinaiticus (K), 10th cent.; Cod. Taurinensis (T), 13th cent. The Greek text with a translation in French is accepted today in *Ignace D'Antioche*, ed. P. Th. Camelot, *Sources chrétiennes*, vol. 10; Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1944, pp. 96-97. In a brief footnote, Camelot contends that subtle distinctions between "voice" and "word" are completely foreign to the text of Ignatius (p. 97).

[18] Lightfoot, p. 206.

[19] Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, Chrysostom 49-50, Opera II, cols 587-596. The address is probably given on the feast day of Ignatius when the relics of the martyred bishop were brought forth and praise offered to God for his life. Chrysostom compares the celebration of the saint to that of the athlete who, after pinning his rivals down on the wrestling mat, comes forth in triumph and is at once hoisted on the shoulders of his admirers and carried homeward with numerous paeans of praise (col 594).

78 Edgemere Ave, *Plainsboro*, NJ 08536

Vigiliae Christianae 47 (1993), 234-245, E. J. Brill, Leiden

THE ARIANS OF ALEXANDRIA

BY

CHRISTOPHER HAAS

Over the past two decades, the stream of scholarly studies on the Arian controversy has risen to a veritable floodtide, resulting from symposia and book-length treatments of Arius's theology (particularly his *Thalia*), his theological antecedents, and the appeal of his preaching as a message of salvation.[1] The vast majority of these valuable studies treat the outbreak of Arianism within Alexandria as a purely theological phenomenon. If the Alexandrian context of the controversy is considered at all, it is treated as only one factor in the theological and philosophical climate which bred Arius' teaching.[2]

Intellectual history, however, seldom takes place in a vacuum. Alexandria in the early fourth century was probably the second largest city in the Roman Empire, and served as the commercial entrepôt for the entire eastern Mediterranean. Tightly organized communities of Jews, pagans, and Christians jostled one another in their ongoing competition for socio-cultural hegemony within this cosmopolitan urban milieu.[3] Arius' teaching gained its first popularity within this richly-textured, socially complex urban environment. Consequently, our understanding of both this outspoken Alexandrian presbyter and his message may be sharpened further by looking closely at the social composition of his first adherents within the city.

Early on, both sides in this local theological dispute appealed to authorities outside Alexandria, thereby embroiling emperors and bishops in over a half-century of empire-wide conflict. The Alexandrian patriarch, Alexander (312-328), enlisted the support of various bishops throughout Palestine and Syria. For his part, Arius gained the backing of several high-placed churchmen, including Eusebius of Nicomedia. Henceforth, the focus of the dispute shifted away from the great Egyptian metropolis. The see of Alexandria became just one of several prizes in the broader arena of ecclesiastical politics fought over by the adherents of various factions. In time, the contentious Alexandrian

presbyter became something of a cipher in the complex theologies of the episcopal opponents of Nicaea—lumped together under the derisive epithet, "Ariomaniacs," by Athanasius.[4] Some have even argued that eventually, Athanasius' Alexandria became a theological backwater, with the intransigent bishop maintaining positions decades old, out of step with the evolving Trinitarian consensus forged by the Cappadocian fathers in the second half of the fourth century.[5] Despite Athanasius' long tenure as head of the city's Homoousian community (albeit frequently in exile), and his reputation for brutality in suppressing dissent within his church, Arianism continued on as an Alexandrian phenomenon for decades.[6] Who were these Alexandrian Arians? And how did this embattled faction change over time?

The initial focus of Arianism in Alexandria was Arius' parish church of Baucalis or Boukolou. This was a relatively minor church in a parochial organization which, by the beginning of the fourth century, included at least nine churches.[7] The city's most important church, named for the beloved former bishop Theonas, was situated in an area largely given over to public buildings at one end of Alexandria's principal boulevard, the *Via Canopica*.[8] Indications are that the episcopal residence and its attached church, that of St. Dionysius, were likewise located on the fringes of the city's center.[9] Christian buildings on the urban periphery were common on the eve of the Peace of the Church, and it was left to later bishops, (notably Athanasius and Theophilus) to fill in the center of the city with large churches. Baucalis was one of a handful of lesser churches which probably could trace their origins back to private donations in the previous two centuries.[10]

It appears as though the church of Baucalis was not in the city at all, but rather was situated in a nearby extra-mural suburb, on the opposite end of town from the bishop's main church. The church took its name from a larger sparsely inhabited region, just beyond the suburb and the adjacent necropolis, which was populated mainly by herdsmen and their flocks of sheep and cattle. This is the district known in the sources as Boukolia or Boukolion, that is, "the pasturage."[11] Throughout Antiquity, grazing took place all along the shores of Lake Mareotis and the canals which criss-crossed this region. extending east of the city as far as the Canopic branch of the Nile.[12] This region of pasturage should be distinguished very carefully from the intensely-cultivated agricultural area of Mareotis to the city's southwest. Augustus seems to have had more than simple logistics in mind when he planted his garrison camp

of Nicopolis in Boukolia, on the only broad landward approach to the city. For the proximity of troops to this pasture-land also served to police the shepherds and herdsmen of Boukolia who were notoriously rough characters, known for assaulting travelers and murdering one another. Palladius tells us of one Roman matron, returning from her tour of the holy places, who ordered her boats to be tied up along the canal near Nicopolis while she went into Alexandria. Her entourage was attacked by locals who killed some, maimed others, and tossed one unfortunate bishop into the canal.[13] And depending upon one's trust in the information provided by Greek romances and by a highly stylized passage in Cassius Dio, the inhabitants of Boukolia may have even broken out in open insurrection against Roman authority in the late 2nd century.[14] In light of the variegated evidence for Baucalis and its adjacent region, I would place the city's cattle market in this suburb, thereby envisioning its economic activity to be roughly comparable to that of early Rome's *Forum Boarium*.

This excursus into Alexandrian topography will assist us in understanding religious factionalism in Alexandria. Epiphanius tells us that presbyters were appointed in each of the parish churches of Alexandria to serve the needs of people dwelling in their immediate neighborhood.[15] This structure was common enough in the larger cities of the empire, but he then goes on to explain that, in Alexandria, the parishioners were exceptionally devoted to the style of Biblical exposition practiced by their respective presbyters—so much so that a rivalry sprung up between the partisans of these local pastors.[16] When one considers that Alexandria had a long tradition of barrio pride and competition, and that the bishop of Alexandria (for all his authority in the Egyptian *chôra*) had a difficult time asserting his will within his own city, it is not surprising that religious factionalism in Alexandria was shaped, at least in part, by the city's topographical divisions.

Thus, in March of 339, when the Arian appointee, Gregory the Cappadocian, made his violent *adventus* into the city accompanied by Philagrius, a veteran Praefectus Aegypti, the Arian mob which attacked the church of Quirinus included herdsmen and shepherds.[17] Athanasius even tells us that they were armed with clubs—in this case probably shepherds' staves. Two decades later we find a similar topographical connection between Arianism and Alexandria's extra-mural regions. Before his appointment to the throne of St. Mark, the Arian bishop George of Cappadocia had spent a portion of his career as a ὑποδέκτης

ταμιακῶν (treasury contractor) in Constantinople, and had acquired thereby a measure of business acumen and a reputation for ruthlessness.[18] It is instructive to note that during his ill-fated tenure in Alexandria, George sought monopolies on papyrus manufacture and reed cutting, as well as a special tax on the extraction of nitre—economic activities concentrated in Alexandria's suburbs. This reliance on the city's peripheral regions is confirmed by George's control over the city's *collegium* of grave-diggers and coffin-bearers, who seemed content with giving George a portion of their profits in exchange for the bishop's patronage.[19]

Arius' congregation at Baucalis also included large numbers of ascetically-minded Alexandrians. This association between Alexandrian asceticism and early Arianism can be accounted for by several factors. The church at Baucalis appears to have been adjacent to the martyrium of St. Mark, since all the various recensions of Mark's passion place his execution and eventual burial at a site known as Boukolou.[20] If one discounts the disputed testimony of the *Passio* of bishop Peter, who was said to have prayed at the tomb of Mark in Boukolou prior to his execution in 311, the earliest mention we have of the evangelist's martyrium dates from the end of the fourth century.[21] It is probable, however, that there was some sort of commemorative shrine for the founder of the Alexandrian church at least as early as the time of Arius, if not before. Several mid- to late fourth century canons attributed to Athanasius carefully regulate the behavior of ascetics (especially virgins) who frequented the shrines of Alexandrian martyrs.[22] The clear inference from these detailed canons is that the most famous martyrium in the city must have attracted monastic devotees. This connection between Alexandrian asceticism and the Evangelist's martyrium continued until the time of the Arab conquest, when both the shrine and its neighboring monasteries were burned during the city's siege.[23]

Besides this link between ascetics and St. Mark's martyrium, we find that many of Alexandria's earliest ascetics retired to the suburban regions just east of the city. It was here that some of Alexandria's most extensive cemeteries were located, known today by the names of Chatby, Ibrahimiya, and el Hadra.[24] During the middle years of the fourth century, these tombs became the hermitages of numerous Alexandrian ascetics.[25] The necropoleis in and around Boukolia continued to appeal to ascetics until the founding of Alexandria's suburban monasteries towards the end of the fouth century.[26] St. Antony himself

considered settling in the region of Boukolia before he withdrew to his inner mountain.[27] Boukolia also served as a recruiting ground for monasticism, as seen especially by the conversion of a young shepherd named Macarius, who murdered one of his comrades along the shore of Lake Mareotis and then fled to the desert as a hermit.[28] Given this context, we find that Arius, the presbyter charged with the pastoral oversight of this region, was noted for his ascetic demeanor and even a style of dress which was characteristic of early Egyptian monks.[29] At the time of his excommunication, over 700 virgins were expelled along with him—a graphic testimony to the appeal of Arianism among Alexandrian ascetics.[30] In addition, there is also the testimony of bishop Alexander who, in a letter to his namesake in Thessalonica, speaks of Arians "troubling us in the lawcourts by the pleas of disorderly women whom they have duped and also discrediting Christianity by the way in which the younger women among them immodestly frequent every public street"— precisely the same immodest behavior addressed by the Alexandrian canons.[31] A letter of Athanasius, preserved in part by Theodoret, complains of, "the impiety of the Arians, [who] block up the gates, and sit like so many demons around the tombs, in order to hinder the dead from being interred."[32] The dating of this fragment is uncertain and may refer to George's monopoly of the funerary *collegia*. However, it could easily be read as an indictment of Arian ascetics, in a vein not unlike the anti-monastic diatribes of a Libanius or a Rutilius Namatianus.

Of course, the bonds between Alexandrian asceticism and Arianism were decisively broken by Athanasius' vigorous courting of the monks, begun as early as the 330's.[33] The clearest expression of this alliance between Athanasius' Homoousion party and the ascetics, both in Alexandria and in the *chôra*, was the celebrated visit of Antony to the city in 338.[34] Though the *vita* gives the impression that Antony came to Alexandria in order to refute publicly the rumors that he secretly espoused Arian doctrines, a close reading makes it clear that Antony's sojourn was orchestrated by Athanasius, doubtless with the intention of enlisting a revered holy man on the side of the Homoousian party.[35] This appears to have become a regular policy of Athanasius, since under similar circumstances he also brought Abba Pambo to Alexandria from Nitria.[36] These high profile monastic endorsements of Athanasius in Alexandria suggest that his cultivation of the monks was a more multifaceted policy than is usually presented, i.e., that the bishop sought to

invoke monastic aid to counterbalance Melitian influence in the *chôra* and also prepare a strategic retreat for himself during moments of imperial displeasure. In light of the make-up of the initial Arian faction in Alexandria, it seems likely that Athanasius also felt a specific need to thwart Arian sentiments among the city's ascetic communities.

However, the complexion of the Alexandrian Arian faction was also changing during the decades following Nicaea. Although Arius' congregation at Baucalis was the most visible center of opposition to the bishop's authority, (in part, a function of the literary sources' preoccupation with Arius), it is worth noting that during the episcopate of Alexander (ca. 312-328) at least five presbyters and five deacons were excommunicated by the bishop, and that each presbyter was likely to have had authority over an individual church. Given the often-fractious nature of the Alexandrian clergy, there is no more reason to believe that these "Arians" formed a monolithic party than that the bishop's party formed a solid phalanx of support. In this context, Athanasius' allegedly brutal methods for enforcing ecclesiastical discipline and doctrinal conformity become much more comprehensible.[37] Despite Epiphanius' enthusiasm for Athanasius, he tells us that Athanasius "kept trying accusations, threats, and admonitions, and no one paid attention."[38]

Among the Arians, there are hints that a more distinctly urban element came to the fore in the thirty some years between Nicaea and the episcopate of George of Cappadocia. Alexander's excommunication of various Alexandrian clergymen suggests that Arian doctrines had found a hearing in several of the city's parishes. In addition, several sources, including a letter of Constantine to the Alexandrians, speak of the spread of Arian sentiments via multi-class urban institutions where the populace would gather, notably the marketplaces, the theatres, and (most frequently) unspecified public assemblies.[39] This may provide at least a partial backdrop for understanding Arius' *Thalia*, and also the well-known comment of Philostorgius on Arius' composition of popular songs designed for sailors, millers, travellers, and others.[40] Perhaps the most telling indication of Athanasius' lack of unquestioned support among the urban populace was the use that his opponents at the Synod of Tyre made of a formal document listing complaints by the Alexandrian *dêmos*.[41]

During the 340's, when imperial coercion was increasingly brought to bear upon the issue of ecclesiastical factionalism in Alexandria, the

urban complexion of the diffuse community labeled as "Arians" by our hostile sources continued to grow. Indeed, there is a direct correlation between official pressure and the morphology of the Arian community, as groups especially vulnerable to outside influence increasingly identify themselves as Arian. These groups tend to cluster at opposite ends of the Alexandrian social spectrum, and their shifting allegiance indicates that the primary issue at stake was patronage, not theology.

With their wealth and status at risk, it is not surprising that large numbers of the so-called bouleutic class took up the Arian cause. These *bouleutai* were members of a hereditary urban elite who made up the Alexandrian senate/council (βουλή).[42] On several occasions, the *bouleutai* of the city were specifically singled out in imperial directives and threatened with fines, confiscations, and imprisonment if they did not renounce Athanasius and accept the imperial nominee.[43] For those who did comply, there were tangible benefits, most importantly, the prospect of ordination as bishop and its attendant privilege of exemption from public duties.[44] By and large, it seems that the bouleutic class was eager to embrace positions which would be deemed inoffensive during an age of frequent reversals in imperial policy. No wonder Athanasius denounces so bitterly these upper class chameleons; the political realities of the day called for "easy-natured men" (εὔκολοι).[45] Their non-confrontational stance was bound to raise the ire of a factious patriarch who had been exiled several times for his views. At the same time, there is also evidence that the Alexandrian upper classes hardly constituted a unified bloc.[46] As with the *curiales* of other large cities, considerable diversity of religious allegiance persisted throughout the entire Late Antique period—provided that dissenting opinions were not publicly expressed.

During the summer and fall of 356, in the period just prior to the installation of George of Cappadocia as Arian bishop of Alexandria, groups of Alexandrian young men took a leading role in the violence directed against the supporters of Athanasius. These youths are depicted vandalizing churches, assaulting clergy, and shouting obscenities at virgins.[47] Athanasius attempts to paint these young men as thoroughgoing pagans, claiming that they cast incense on bonfires of church furniture, sang praises to pagan gods, and even waved tree branches in the church sanctuaries—perhaps an indication of Dionysiac behavior. Yet, some of these same youths are ordained, in short order, as Arian bishops throughout Egypt.[48] Despite Athanasius' characteriza-

tion of them as belonging to the ἀγοραῖοι, (i.e., the lower class frequenters of the agora), it is more plausible to believe that they belonged to the same class as the other Arian nominees—the Alexandrian bouleutic class. These youths are simply styled νεώτεροι in the sources, and this may be an echo of upper class youth organizations known in the early Empire as the *neoi*. The *neoi* were clubs of young men just past the age for ephebes (17), and often were connected with the gymnasium, electing their own officers and even maintaining club treasuries.[49] Their upper class origins are strongly suggested by a letter of Constantius to the senate and people of Alexandria, wherein he requires the young men "to assemble together, and either to persecute Athanasius, or consider themselves as (the emperor's) enemies."[50] Formal groups of Alexandrian youths appear to have taken an active role in political brawling as far back as the Ptolemaic period. Their importance in urban power politics was tacitly recognized by Caracalla, who assembled them and then ordered their massacre in 215.[51] Like their uppercrust elders, the youth of Alexandria made up an easily distinguished social group which could be threatened and mobilized by imperial directives. By all appearances, they had no abiding concern with theological issues, but were motivated by class interests and civic pride.

At the other end of the social scale, the recipients of public assistance were also susceptible to the coercive powers of imperial officials. One method of coercion employed time and again was simply to limit the grain dole to those who conformed to imperial dictates.[52] In addition, there is evidence that oil and other regular alms were confiscated from Athanasius' supporters.[53] This may, in part, reflect the government's wish to disrupt the patriarchate's elaborate network of patronage within the city. Widows and the city's destitute (ἀνέξοδοι) suffered most under these measures.[54] Athanasius gives us the impression that despite these coercive methods, the lower orders remained faithful Homoousians. However, the veracity of his claim is difficult to determine, especially given the wide success enjoyed by the Prefect Florus a century later, when rioting in the city was promptly extinguished after the Prefect cut off the bread dole.[55]

There are hints that other groups within Alexandrian society gave their allegiance to the Arian (or more precisely, the imperial) cause during the 340's and the 350's. One cryptic remark of Athanasius speaks of certain unspecified *collegia* who were incited to anti-Homoousion violence by imperial agents.[56] In addition, we also hear of the ἀγοραῖοι,

i.e., otherwise unoccupied lower class frequenters of the *agora*, who are enlisted in pagan and Arian mobs.[57]

Given the attractions of the Arian cause to certain sections of Alexandrian society, one can more easily understand how it was possible for Gregory the Cappodocian to find a viable local community of co-religionists when, in 339, he entered Alexandria backed by imperial troops.[58] Though diffuse, this Arian "community" possessed enough of a self-identity to insist on the ailing Gregory's replacement in 346 with someone who would promote their interests more vigorously.[59] These Alexandrian Arians wished to present a clear alternative to Athanasius, who had incurred both imperial and ecclesiastical ill-will through his violent methods. Consequently, the Arians found Gregory to be a liability, since his tenure as bishop was marked by violence and arson. The next Arian occupant of the throne of St. Mark was Gregory's countryman, George. It is only with the disastrous episcopate of George of Cappadocia (357-361) that Arianism loses all appeal among the Alexandrians, due to the association of the Arian cause with this unpopular and inept imperial appointee. George instituted a brutal regime which indiscriminately persecuted pagans, Jews, and Homoousian Christians. These methods led to George's death at the hand of a mob in December of 361.[60] The collapse of the Arian cause in Alexandria is clearly evidenced some 15 years after George's murder, when the support for the Arian Lucius (himself an Alexandrian) extends only as far as the coercion bought by the Prefect's spears.[61]

NOTES

[1] As a mere sampling of this extensive literature, consult M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana del IV secolo* (Rome, 1975); A.M. Ritter, 'Arianismus' in *Theologische Real-Enzyklopädie* G. Krause and G. Müller, eds. (Berlin, 1978) 3: 692-719; R.C. Gregg and D.E. Groh, *Early Arianism: A View of Salvation* (Philadelphia, 1981); C. Kannengiesser, 'Arius and the Arians,' *Theological Studies* 44 (1983): 456-475; R.C. Gregg, ed., *Arianism: Historical and Theological Reassessments* (Philadelphia, 1985); R. Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition* (London, 1987); R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God* (Edinburgh, 1988).

[2] L.W. Barnard, 'The Antecedents of Arius,' *VigChr* 24 (1970): 172-188; M.H. Marrou, 'L'Arianisme comme Phénomène Alexandrin,' *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, Comptes Rendus* (1973): 533-542; C. Kannengiesser, *Holy Scripture and Hellenistic Hermeneutics in Alexandrian Christology: The Arian Crisis*, Protocol of the Colloquy of the Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture, no. 41 (Berkeley, 1982). The best treatments of the Alexandrian background for the controversy

may be found in Williams, *Arius*, pp. 29-32, 41-47; and in C. Kannengiesser, 'Athanasius of Alexandria vs. Arius: *The* Alexandrian Crisis,' *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, B. Pearson and J. Goehring, eds. (Philadelphia, 1986), pp. 204-215.

[3] On Alexandrian in Late Antiquity, see M. Rodziewicz, *Les Habitations Romaines Tardives d'Alexandrie à la lumière des fouilles polonaises à Kôm el-Dikka*, in the series, *Alexandrie* III, (Warsaw, 1984); P.M. Fraser, 'Alexandria, Christian and Medieval' in *The Coptic Encyclopedia* I: 88-92 (New York, 1990); H. Heinen, 'Alexandria in Late Antiquity' Idem 1: 95-103; and C.J. Haas, *Late Roman Alexandria* (Baltimore, forthcoming). For the wider Egyptian context during this period, see the useful summary article of R.S. Bagnall, 'Late Roman Egypt' in *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* 10: 453-456 (New York, 1988), as well as his fuller exposition in *Late Roman Egypt* (Princeton, forthcoming).

[4] A catalogue of Arian disavowals of Arius may be found in Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, pp. 123-128.

[5] J.M. Leroux, 'Athanase et la seconde phase de la crise arienne (345-373),' in Kannengiesser, ed. *Politique et Théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie* (Paris, 1974), pp. 145-156.

[6] For recent surveys of Athanasius' career, see the important collection of articles in C. Kannengiesser, ed., *Politique et Théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie* (Paris, 1974); M. Tetz, in *Theologische Realenzykopädie* 4: 333-349 (New York and Berlin, 1978); G.C. Stead, in *Dizionario Patristico e di Antichità Cristiane* 1: 413-432 (Casale Monferrato, 1983); A.S. Atiya, in *The Coptic Encyclopedia* 1: 298-302 (New York, 1991); T.D. Barnes, *Athanasius of Alexandria: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (forthcoming). A useful bibliographical essay may be found in C. Kannengiesser, 'The Athanasian Decade 1974-1984,' *Theological Studies* 46 (1985): 524-541.

[7] Epiph. *Haer.* 69. 2. 2-7. The best single survey of church topography in Alexandria is A. Martin, 'Les premiers siècles du christianisme à Alexandrie: Essai de topographie religieuse (IIIe-IVe siècles),' *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 30 (1984): 211-225. On parochial organization see A. Martin, 'Topographie et Liturgie: Le Problème des 'Paroisses' d'Alexandrie,' in *Actes du XIe Congrès International d'Archéologie Chrétienne*, École Française de Rome (Rome, 1989) 2: 1133-1144.

[8] Athan. *Apol. ad Constant.* 15: *M. petr. Al.* 16. in P. Devos, 'Une passion grecque inédite de S. Pierre d'Alexandria et sa traduction par Anastase le Bibliothécaire,' *AnBol* 83 (1965): 157-187. See also C. Haas, 'Alexandria's *Via Canopica*: Political Expression & Urban Topography from Augustus to 'Amr ibn al-'As,' in *Alexandrian Studies in Memory of Daoud Abu Daoud*, ed., Nabil Swelim (Cairo, 1993), forthcoming.

[9] Socrates *HE* 2. 11. 6; *Hist. Aceph.* 2. 3, 5. 4.

[10] For a useful comparative study of this process, see L.M. White, *Building God's House in the Roman World: Architectural Adaptation Among Pagans, Jews, and Christians* (Baltimore, 1989).

[11] Epiph. *Haer.* 69. 1-2; *Chron. Pasch.* 252 cols. 608c-609a; *M. Petr. Al.* 11.

R. Williams suggests (*Arius*, p. 264, n. 107) that the church in Baucalis derived its name from the Greek word for a wine or water cooler, and that the church was formerly used as a vintner's warehouse. Given the economic differentiation of Alexandria's topography, it seems more likely that vinters' warehouses would be located, on the opposite side of the city, near the famous wine growing regions of Taenia and Mareotis: Strabo 17. 1. 15; Pliny *HN* 14. 74, 117; Virgil *Georg.* 2. 91; Horace *Odes* 1. 37; Athenaeus *Deipnosophistes* 1. 33; *v. Jo. Eleem.* 10.

[12] The use of this region as pasturage by βουκόλοι dates back before Alexander's foundation of the city; Strabo 17. 1. 19.

[13] *Hist. Laus.* 15. 1, 35. 14-15.

[14] Achilles Tatius 3. 15; Heliodorus 1.5-30; Cassius Dio 71. 4. On the evolution of the βουκόλοι as a literary type, see J. Winkler, 'Lollianos and the Desperadoes,' *JHS* 100 (1980): 155-181, esp. 175-179.

[15] Epiph. *Haer.* 69. 1. 1.

[16] Epiph. *Haer.* 69. 2. 6.

[17] Athan. *Hist. Ar.* 10.

[18] Greg. Naz. *Or.* 21. 16; Athan. *de Syn.* 12; *ad Episcopos* 7; *Hist. Ar.* 75.

[19] Epiph. *Haer.* 76. 1. 5-7. See also C. Haas, 'The Alexandrian Riots of 356 and George of Cappadocia,' *Greek, Roman & Byzantine Studies* 32. 3 (1991): 281-301.

[20] A thorough discussion of the traditions connecting Mark with Boukolou/Boukolia may be found in B.A. Pearson, 'Earliest Christianity in Egypt: some Observations,' *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, B. Pearson and J. Goehring, eds. (Philadelphia, 1986), pp. 132-159.

[21] *M.Petr. Al.* 11-14; Palladius *Hist. Laus.* 45.

[22] *Canons of Athanasius* 91-92, 98-99, ed. and trans. W. Riedel and W.E. Crum (London, 1904).

[23] *History of the Patriarchs* 1. 14, p. 495 <231>, ed. and trans. B. Evetts *Patrologia Orientalis* 1. 4 (1907).

[24] *M. Petr. Al.* 14 indicates that Peter's executioners took him "from the south side of the commemorative chapel of the holy evangelist Mark, and stood him in a deep valley where there were tombs." On these cemeteries, see A. Bernand, *Alexandrie la grande* (Paris, 1966), pp. 210-216, 222-228.

[25] E.g., an unnamed ascetic who inhabited a cell for many years near the military camp at Nicopolis, (*Apoph. Patr.* Systematic Coll. 237).

[26] Palladius *Hist. Laus.* 5. 1.

[27] Athan. *v. Ant.* 49.

[28] Palladius *Hist. Laus.* 15.

[29] Epiph. *Haer.* 69. 3. 1.

[30] Epiph. *Haer.* 69. 3. 2.

[31] In Theodoret *HE* 1. 3.

[32] Theodoret *HE* 2. 11.

[33] L.-T. Lefort, 'Saint Athanase écrivain copte.' *Le Muséon* 46 (1933): 1-33; P. Rousseau, *Ascetics, Authority, and the Church in the Age of Jerome and Cassian* (Oxford, 1978); G.J.M. Bartelink, 'Les rapports entre le monachisme égyptienne et l'épiscopat d'Alexandrie,' *Alexandrina: Hellénisme. judaïsme et christianisme à Alexandrie, Mélanges offerts au P. Claude Mondésert*, l'Institut des Sources Chrétiennes (Paris, 1987), pp. 351-363.

[34] Athan. *v. Ant.* 69-71.

[35] Several years later, Flavian of Antioch followed an identical policy by persuading a desert ascetic named Julianus to publicly denounce Arianism in Antioch, (Theodoret *HE* 4. 24).

[36] *Apoph. Patr.* Pambo 4.

[37] On this controversial aspect of Athanasius' episcopate, see T.D. Barnes, 'The Career of Athanasius,' in *Studia Patristica* vol. 21, *Papers presented to the Tenth International*

Conference on Patristic Studies, 1987, ed. by E.A. Livingstone (Leuven, 1989), pp. 390-401;—a depiction which should be seen in light of D.W.H. Arnold, 'Sir Harold Idris Bell and Athanasius: A Reconsideration of *London Papyrus* 1914,'Ibid., pp. 377-383. See also Hanson, (supra n. 1) pp. 239-246.

[38] Epiph. *Haer.* 69. 11. 7; 68. 7. 5.

[39] Socrates *HE* 1. 6-7; Sozomen *HE* 2.23.

[40] Philostorgius *HE* 2. 2.

[41] "A document was then read, containing popular complaints (καὶ γραμματεῖον ἀνεγινώσκετο δημοτικῶν ἐκβοήσεων) that the people of Alexandria could not continue their attendance at church on his account." Sozomen *HE* 2. 25, col 1004a.

[42] See D. Delia, *Alexandrian Citizenship During the Roman Principate* (Atlanta, 1991); Haas, *Late Roman Alexandria*, chap. 3.

[43] Athan. *Ep. Ency.* 4; *Hist. Ar.* 31, 48-49, 54.

[44] Athan. *Apol. ad Constant.* 28; *Hist. Ar.* 73.

[45] Athan. *Hist. Ar.* 78 col. 788d.

[46] Aside from the probable pagan majority among the *bouleutai*, the urban elite undoubtedly included some Homoousians since Athanasius himself mentions certain "well-born men" (εὐγενεῖς ἄνδρας) who were persecuted during the Arian conflict in 339: Athan. *Ep. Ency.* 4 col. 232a.

[47] Athan. *Hist. Ar.* 55-56.

[48] Athan. *Hist. Ar.* 73.

[49] See C.A. Forbes, *Neoi* (Middletown, Conn., 1933); J. Delorme, *Gymnasion* (Bibliotheque des Écoles Françaises d'Athens et de Rome, 1960); Pauly-Wissowa *R-E* s. v. 'Neoi' by F. Poland, vol. 16.2: 2401-2409; and D. Delia, *Alexandrian Citizenship*, pp. 71-88.

[50] Athan. *Hist. Ar.* 48.

[51] Herodian 4. 9. 6-7; Cassius Dio 78. 23.

[52] Athan. *Ep. Ency.* 4; *Hist. Ar.* 31, 54.

[53] Athan. *Hist. Ar.* 13, *Hist. Ar.* 72.

[54] Athan. *Apol. de Fuga.* 6; *Hist. Ar.* 13, 60-61.

[55] Evagrius *HE* 2. 5.

[56] Athan. *Apol. c. Ar.* 15; *Hist. Ar.* 55.

[57] Athan. *Hist. Ar.* 54-55, 58. For this social grouping, cf. Acts of the Apostles 17: 1-9; Plut. *Aem.* 38. 3. In Alexandria, they appear earlier in Philo *in Flaccum* 64, 95; *Legatio ad Gaium* 122. The ἀγοραῖοι appear to be identical to the group referred to as "those of the Dromos," (*M. Petr. Al.* 16).

[58] Athan. *Ep. Ency.* 6.

[59] *Festal Index* 18.

[60] On the sequence of these events, see M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana*, pp. 226-230, 326-333; E.D. Hunt, Christians and Christianity in Ammianus Marcellinus,' *CQ* n.s. 35 (1985) 186-200; J. Matthews, *The Roman Empire of Ammianus* (Baltimore, 1989), pp. 441-444; M. Caltabiano, 'L'assassinio di Giorgio di Cappadocia,' *Quaderni Catanesi di Studi classici e medievali* 7 (1985): 17-57; and Haas, supra n. 19.

[61] Theodoret *HE* 4. 18-19: *Festal Index* 39; *Hist. Aceph.* 5. 11-13.

Department of History
Villanova University, *Villanova*, Pennsylvania 19085

Vigiliae Christianae 47 (1993), 246-259, E. J. Brill, Leiden

"GEMEINSCHAFT DER HEILIGEN"

HERKUNFT UND BEDEUTUNG DES GLAUBENSARTIKELS

VON

HEINZ KRUSE

Unter den Glaubensartikeln des *Symbolum Apostolicum* (Apostolisches Glaubensbekenntnis, AGb) nimmt die "Gemeinschaft der Heiligen" in mancher Beziehung eine Sonderstellung ein. Die Worte "*sanctorum communio*" sind nicht nur der jüngste Zusatz zu einem weit älteren Kontext; sie sind in ihrer Herkunft und Bedeutung immer noch umstritten,[1] und sie sind, wenn unsre Ausführungen zutreffen, der am meisten mißverstandene aller Glaubensartikel.

Das AGb ist das Taufbekenntnis der Kirche Roms und der von Rom abhängigen Kirchen. Bei den Griechen und den östlichen Kirchen ist ein "apostolisches" Taufsymbol unbekannt, obwohl sicher auch dort den Taufbewerbern ein Bekenntnis ihres Glaubens als Vorbedingung der Taufe in irgendeiner Form abverlangt wurde. Schon hieraus geht hervor, daß das AGb nicht direkt von den Aposteln abgefaßt und angeordnet worden sein kann. Wohl aber ist es apostolischen Ursprungs, insofern es aus den Schriften der Apostel, dem Neuen Testament, abgeleitet ist. Seinem Zweck entsprechend mußte es möglichst kurz und einprägsam sein und doch alles Wesentliche des christlichen Glaubens enthalten; Erklärungen und Folgerungen wurden im vorausgehenden Taufunterricht hinzugefügt. Seine frühesten Formulierungen, die fast alle in Kleinigkeiten von einander abweichen (ohne principiell der Willkür überlassen zu sein), lassen sich bis ins zweite Jahrhundert zurückverfolgen.[2]

Harnack[3] meinte, als älteste Form folgenden Wortlaut ansetzen zu können (die zu Vergleichszwecken beigefügte Zählung stammt von mir):

1. Ich glaube an Gott, den allmächtigen Vater,
2. und an Jesus Christus, seinen eingeborenen Sohn, unsern Herrn,
3. der geboren ist aus heiligem Geist und Maria der Jungfrau,
4. der unter Pontius Pilatus gekreuzigt und begraben ist,
5. am dritten Tage auferstanden von den Todten,
6. aufgefahren in die Himmel,

7. sich setzend zur Rechten des Vaters,
8. woher er kommt zu richten Lebendige und Todte,
9. und an heiligen Geist,
10. heilige Kirche,
11. Vergebung der Sünden,
12. Fleisches Auferstehung.

Harnack fügt hinzu: "Man kann es als ein gesichertes Ergebnis der Forschung bezeichnen: das alte römische Symbol, dessen Wortlaut wir oben mitgetheilt haben, ist um die Mitte oder kurz vor der Mitte des 2. Jahrhunderts entstanden" (aaO. 10). Dieselbe Einteilung in zwölf Aussagen und die Behauptung, daß die Apostel es abgefaßt hätten, wird zuerst von Ambrosius mitgeteilt.[4]

Aus den Taufsymbolen entwickelten sich die Synodalsymbole, Glaubensbekenntnisse, in denen die Ergebnisse von Bischofssynoden zusammengefaßt wurden, nach dem Vorbild des 1. Konzils von Nicaea (325). Sie sind ausführlicher, besonders in den Teilen kontroversen Inhalts und sollten den Bischöfen als Richtlinien dienen.

Die Taufsymbole sind naturgemäß sehr konservativ, denn es galt, die Einheit und Beständigkeit des Glaubens zu wahren. Nur selten wurden unnötige Erweiterungen gemacht, z.B. zu »Vater«: »allmächtigen« (in Art. 7). Noch seltener sind Zusätze, die einem neuen Glaubensartikel gleichkommen, wie z.B. »Abgestiegen in die Unterwelt«.[5] Hierher gehört auch unser Satz: »(Ich glaube an) eine Gemeinschaft der Heiligen«. Als ältester Zeuge dafür gilt, wie überall zu lesen ist, Niketas, Bischof von Remesiana in Moesia (Serbien), einer ziemlich abgelegenen Kirchenprovinz an der Donau. Sein Credo (DS 19) scheint übrigens auch das erste lateinische zu sein, das den heutigen Schluß des AGb enthält: »An ein ewiges Leben«.[6]

Der Schluß lautet: »*In Spiritum Sanctum, sanctam Ecclesiam catholicam, communionem sanctorum (!), remissionem peccatorum, carnis resurrectionem et viam aeternam.*« Betreffs der Chronologie weiß man nur soviel, daß Niketas »nach 414 gestorben« ist. Wann er Bischof wurde und wann er seine »*Explanatio Symboli habita ad competentes*« verfaßt hat, bleibt unsicher. Nichts garantiert, sie vor 400 anzusetzen.

Ist es nun denkbar, daß ein kaum bekannter unbedeutender Bischof am Rande der Christenheit auf eigene Verantwortung für seine Diözese einen neuen Glaubensartikel (denn darauf kommt der Zusatz hinaus) eingeführt hätte? Was könnte sein Motiv gewesen sein? War ihm der neue Glaubenssatz so wichtig für das Glaubensleben seiner Christen,

daß er ihn zu den Grundwahrheiten des Christentums zählte? Das müßte dann ja an seiner Erklärung zu sehen sein. Er beginnt: »*Ecclesia quid aliud, quam sanctorum omnium congregatio*« (§10), d.h. er sieht in der »*communio sanctorum*« eine erklärende Apposition zu dem vorausgehenden »*ecclesia*«, wie es seit dem Catechismus Romanus und allenthalben heute üblich ist, die *communitas fidelium*. Und das in einem Kontext, der allen Wiederholungen und Erklärungen abhold ist. Daß dies der ursprüngliche Sinn nicht sein kann, wird im Folgenden noch klarer werden. D.h. also, Niketas hat seinen neuen Glaubensartikel selbst nicht verstanden, sondern blindlings anderswoher übernommen, und die Wortstellung eigenhändig verändert.

Die nächstältesten Zeugen sind fast alle auf Südgallien beschränkt[7] und reichen vom 5. bis zum 8. Jahrhundert. Nur das *Antiphonale Benchorense* (Bangor in Nord-Irland) liegt abseits von diesem Gebiet und weicht auch durch die Umstellung »*remissa peccatorum, sanctorum commonionem*« von den übrigen ab (DS 29). Erst im 9. Jh. übernahm die Kirche Roms unter dem Einfluß Karls des Großen von der Kirche Galliens(!) die uns geläufige Form (cf. DS 30), die sich dann von Rom auf die gesamte lateinisch sprechende Kirche ausdehnte.

Beachtlich ist, daß auch die übrigen größeren Zusätze zum alten römischen AGb zugleich von dort übernommen wurden: »Abgefahren zur Unterwelt« und »ein ewiges Leben« (vgl. DS 27. 28. 29. 30).

Zum Vergleich mit dem Ausgangspunkt sei hier die heutige Endform des AGb nach dem Römischen Brevier mit der Zählung des Catechismus Romanus abgedruckt:

1. Ich glaube an Gott, den Vater, den Allmächtigen, den Schöpfer des Himmels und der Erde,
2. und an Jesus Christus, seinen eingeborenen Sohn, unsern Herrn,
3. empfangen durch den Heiligen Geist, geboren von der Jungfrau Maria,
4. gelitten unter Pontius Pilatus, gekreuzigt, gestorben und begraben, hinabgestiegen in das Reich des Todes,
5. am dritten Tage auferstanden von den Toten,
6. aufgefahren in den Himmel; er sitzt zur Rechten Gottes, des allmächtigen Vaters;
7. von dort wird er kommen, zu richten die Lebenden und die Toten.
8. Ich glaube an den Heiligen Geist,
9. die heilige katholische Kirche, Gemeinschaft der Heiligen,
10. Vergebung der Sünden,
11. Auferstehung der Toten
12. und das ewige Leben.

Die äußere Geschichte unsres problematischen Glaubensartikels wäre damit, wenn auch nur skizzenhaft, hinreichend dargelegt. Wir müssen nun daran gehen, den ursprünglichen Sinn und die Absicht des unbekannten Autors herauszubekommen. Denn es ist klar, daß nicht die Stimmenmehrheit späterer Erklärer den zuerst gemeinten Sinn autoritativ umbestimmen kann.

Den meisten (katholischen wie protestantischen) Erklärern[8] scheint es evident, daß mit der »Gemeinschaft« eine konkrete »Gemeinde« von Menschen gemeint ist, die Gemeinde der Christgläubigen, sowohl der Lebenden als auch der Verstorbenen, also die Gesamtkirche. Diese würden »Heilige« genannt, weil im NT offenbar alle Christen »Heilige« heißen. Der Haupteinwand gegen diese Deutung als Kirche der Heiligen ist, daß diese heilige Gemeinde ja schon kurz vorher als Gegenstand des Glaubens genannt wurde (»eine heilige katholische Kirche«) und der stichwortartige Stil des AGb eine Apposition oder Wiederholung durch ein Synonym ausschließt. Manche schränken den Ausdruck ein auf die Kirche als »Leib Christi«, dessen Teile sich gegenseitig fördern können und sollen, und sehen dann darin ein Programm christlicher Soziologie.[9] Damit wäre aber eher ein Desiderat und Postulat genannt, als eine offenbarte Tatsache, die Gegenstand eines Glaubensartikels sein könnte.

Ausschlaggebend ist der biblische Sprachgebrauch, denn der Interpolator wollte sicherlich im Kontext des AGb bleiben. Und da stellen wir fest, daß *communio* im Vulgata-Latein des NT überhaupt nur einmal vorkommt, in Hbr 13, 16, wo es den Sinn von »Gebefreudigkeit« hat. Wenn wir voraussetzen könnten, daß der Ausdruck ursprünglich griechisch abgefaßt wurde und dann (wie Hbr 13, 16) wahrscheinlich (ἡ τῶν ἁγίων) κοινωνία hieß, erhalten wir eine breitere Basis. Aber man muß zugeben, daß κοινωνία (19 mal im NT) dort nie den Sinn von konkreter »Gemeinde« hat,[10] sondern immer im Abstrakten bleibt (vgl. ThWbNT III, 798, 43ff): Anteilhaben, Anteilgeben, Gemeinschaft (im Sinne von Gemeinsamkeit).

Mit der konkreten Deutung von *communio* verknüpft ist die fragliche Deutung der »Heiligen« als Bezeichung für die Gesamtheit der Christen. Die im NT »Heilige« genannte Gemeinde scheint zunächst auf die Urgemeinde von Jerusalem gemünzt gewesen zu sein, soweit sie sich in der ersten Begeisterung der »Naherwartung« zu einer klösterlichen Gemeinschaft mit freiwilliger (Apg 5, 4) Armut und Ehelosigkeit zusammengeschlossen hatte, nicht einfach alle Gläubigen. Später scheinen sich auch

anderswo solche Gruppen gebildet zu haben, z.B. in Lydda (Apg 9, 32), sodaß sich schließlich der Ausdruck auf alle Getauften ausdehnen konnte. Der Grund, weshalb sie sich so nannten, oder vielmehr von anderen so genannt wurden, war jedenfalls nicht, daß sie für sittlich vollkommen oder sündlos gehalten worden wären (sittliche Heiligkeit), sondern weil sie sich Gott geweiht und geschenkt hatten (ontische Heiligkeit; nicht zu verwechseln mit kultischer Heiligkeit). Dieser Wortgebrauch verschwand jedoch im Laufe des 2. Jh. bis auf wenige Reste (z.B. im liturgischen Ruf »Das Heilige den Heiligen!»), offenbar, weil er anmaßend klang. Erst im 4. Jh. zogen daraus in Nordafrika die Donatisten den Schluß, die ganze Kirche müßte aus sündlosen Heiligen bestehen, und schlossen die Sünder aus ihrer Kirche der Heiligen aus. Sollte sich ein donatistischer Glaubensartikel in das AGb eingeschlichen haben, und das im äußersten Norden der Kirche, in Serbien?

Eine andere Alternative, die weit weniger vertreten wird, als die »Kirche der Heiligen«, ist das sachliche Verständnis: Man faßt »*sanctorum*« als Neutrum und übersetzt »Teilnahme an heiligen Dingen«, d.h. an den Sakramenten. Diese Möglichkeit wird belegt durch ein Reskript aus dem Jahre 388, durch das Apollinaristen »*a communione sanctorum*« verbannt, d.h. vom Eucharistieempfang ausgeschlossen wurden.[11] Sowohl *communio* im Westen, wie κοινωνία im Osten wurden später im Sinne von »Eucharistie-Empfang« gebraucht, worauf Vokes (aaO.) hinweist. Aber was sollte es wohl heißen zu bekennen: »Ich glaube an den Empfang der Eucharistie«? Teilnahme an den Sakramenten ist bis heute ein anerkanntes Zeichen der Kirchenzugehörigkeit. Aber abgesehen vom Wortgebrauch des NT (*sancta*/τὰ ἅγια heißt dort immer nur »Heiligtum, Tempel«), scheint dies Einheitspostulat kein geeigneter Inhalt für einen besonderen Glaubensartikel zu sein. Um 400 hätte man auch deutlicher »*sacramentorum*« sagen können und müssen.

Unter diesen Umständen wird man Harnack zustimmen müssen, wenn er diese beiden Deutungsmöglichkeiten ablehnt und den Zusatz »Gemeinschaft der Heiligen« für dunkel erklärt.[12] Ist die Lage wirklich so verzweifelt? Mir scheint, es gibt eine dritte Möglichkeit der Deutung, die m.W. bisher kaum Beachtung fand. Mit dem substantivierten Adjektiv »die Heiligen« werden im Alten Testament oft die *Engel* bezeichnet. Besonders in dem von Jesus und den ntl. Autoren hochgeschätzten Danielbuch spielen diese »Heiligen« eine bedeutende Rolle; auch der »Menschensohn« von Dan 7, 13 gehört zu ihnen. Im nachexilischen Judentum hatte sich, auf die Propheten gestützt, der Glaube her-

ausgebildet, daß in der Endzeit die guten Himmelsgeister über Satan und seinen Anhang siegen und die Gottesherrschaft unter den Menschen begründen würden (Dan 7, 18). Aber auch sonst werden im Alten Testament unter »den Heiligen« (*qdošim*, zu unterscheiden von *hasidim*, »die Frommen«) mit wenigen Ausnahmen die Engel verstanden.[13] Im NT ist dieser Wortgebrauch, wie wir sahen, durch einen anderen überdeckt worden. An der Mehrzahl der substantivierten ἅγιοι-Stellen (etwa 60) sind mit »den Heiligen« sicher lebende Christen gemeint. Es gibt aber auch noch mehrere Stellen, an denen der atl. Sprachgebrauch weiterlebt, z.B. in den Thessalonicherbriefen: »Wenn Jesus, unser Herr, mit all seinen Heiligen wiederkommt« (1Thess 3, 13; ähnlich 2Thess 1, 10; Jud 14; vgl. Mt 25, 31; Lk 9, 26; Apk 14, 10). Hier sind ausschließlich Engel gemeint. Besonders aufschlußreich ist Kol 1, 12: »(Gott) hat euch fähig gemacht, Anteil zu haben am Los der Heiligen, die im Lichte sind«. Gnilka ist zweifellos im Recht, wenn er schreibt: »Die Heiligen sind — analog zu einer in Qumran zu belegenden Vorstellung — die Engel«.[14] »Damals (bei der Taufe) gewannen sie (die Kolosser) Anteil am Los der Heiligen im Licht« (S.46). Die Verbindung mit »Anteilhaben« führt uns unmittelbar auf unsern Glaubensartikel. Man bekommt, durch Gottes Gnade, Anteil an etwas, worauf man natürlicherweise keinen Anspruch hat. Den Engeln wird dadurch nichts genommen, und die Menschen werden dadurch nicht zu Engeln, sondern nur in gewisser Hinsicht auf eine ähnliche Seinsstufe erhoben. »Anteilnehmen« an Personen[15] heißt auch nicht einfach »beisammensein« oder »zugelassen werden« (die Engel gehören nicht zur Kirche), denn der Ort spielt im Reich des Lichtes keine Rolle. Es handelt sich natürlich um ontische Heiligkeit (Gottgehörigkeit, Gottesnähe, was spätere Theologen die heiligmachende Gnade genannt haben), nicht um sittliche Werkgerechtigkeit. Zur vollen Entfaltung kommt diese Heiligkeit erst im Jenseits; aber sie ist auch auf Erden schon keimhaft vorhanden, vgl. 1Joh 3, 2: »Jetzt sind wir Kinder Gottes, aber was wir sein werden, ist noch nicht offenbar. Wir wissen, daß wir ihm ähnlich sein werden, denn wir werden ihn schauen, wie er ist.« Worin diese Erhebung konkret besteht, bleibt vorläufig Geheimnis, aber sie muß auf der Ebene des Geistes liegen: Erkenntnis, Liebe, Seligkeit, mit einem Wort, ewiges Leben.

Engel sind schließlich auch gemeint in Eph 1, 18; 2, 19; 3, 18 (15). Besonders 2, 19 muß so verstanden werden: »Ihr seid also jetzt nicht mehr Fremde, ohne Bürgerrecht, sondern Mitbürger der Heiligen und Hausgenossen Gottes«. Nicht die Juden als solche, sondern die

Judenchristen, waren durch Gnade zu »Heiligen und Hausgenossen Gottes« erhoben worden. So versteht man auch Hbr 12, 23: »(Ihr seid aufgenommen) zur Gemeinde der Erstgeborenen, die im Himmel eingeschrieben sind.« Die Erstgeborenen sind die Engel, nicht die Juden.

Sehr bedeutsam für unsre Frage ist, daß (worauf schon Gnilka aufmerksam machte) auch die Mitglieder der Qumran-Vereinigung (*yahad*) an eine Gemeinschaft (Teilnahme) mit den »Heilige« genannten Engeln glaubte. Man vergleiche folgende Qumran-Texte:

1QS (Gemeinderegel), 11, 7-8: »Welche Gott erwählt hat, denen hat er sie (die Einsicht) zu ewigem Besitz gegeben, und Anteil hat er ihnen gegeben am Los der Heiligen, und mit den Söhnen des Himmels hat er ihre Versammlung verbunden zu einem Rat der Gemeinschaft (*yahad*)...«

1QH (Loblieder), 3, 21f: »Den verkehrten Geist hast du gereinigt von großer Missetat, daß er sich stelle an den Standort mit dem Heer der Heiligen und in die Gemeinschaft eintrete mit der Gemeinde der Himmelssöhne.«

1QH (Loblieder) 6, 13: »Du läßt kommen deine Treue und deine Herrlichkeit zu allen Männern deines Rates und in ein Los gemeinsam mit den Engeln des Angesichtes.«

1QH (Loblieder) 11, 10-11: »Um deiner Ehre willen hast du den Menschen von Sünde gereinigt, daß er sich heilige ... daß er vereint sei mit den Söhnen deiner Wahrheit und im Los mit deinen Heiligen.«

1QM (Kriegsrolle) 12, 1 + 7: »Die Menge der Heiligen ist bei dir im Himmel und die Heerscharen der Engel in deiner Wohnstatt ... Die Gemeinde der Heiligen ist in unserer Mitte...«

(Nach E. Lohse, *Die Texte von Qumran*, [2]1971).

Ob diese Gemeinschaft dort über eine bloße äußere Zugehörigkeit oder ein Beisammensein im Jenseits hinausgeht und eine innere Anteilnahme (Ähnlichkeit) miteinschließt, bleibt fraglich.

Auf der Suche nach einem möglichen Schriftfundament für unseren Glaubensartikel konnten wir feststellen, daß die einzig passende Bedeutung, »Anteilnahme an der Natur der Engel«, im AT zwar gut belegt ist (die Qumran-Mönche schöpften sicherlich nur aus dem AT), im NT jedoch selten und weniger deutlich. Als Grundlage für einen Glaubensartikel scheint diese Basis zu schmal. Ist die Beziehung zu den Engeln wirklich so wichtig, daß sie zu den Hauptwahrheiten des christlichen Glaubens gezählt werden müßte? Wohl kaum. Aber sie darf nicht iso-

liert genommen werden, sie muß mit ihren Synonymen und Parallelen zusammengesehen werden, und dann ergibt sich, daß sie »nur die Spitze des Eisbergs« ist.

Wenn Jesus den Sadduzäern entgegnet: »Ihr irrt euch, ihr kennt weder die Schrift noch die Macht Gottes. Denn nach der Auferstehung werden die Menschen nicht mehr heiraten, sondern werden sein *wie die Engel im Himmel*« (Mt 22, 30 par), so deutete er damit an, daß uns eine einschneidende Umwandlung bevorsteht. Der Auferstehungsleib ist ein himmlischer, geistartiger, engelhafter Leib (1Kor 15, 44; 2Kor 5, 2). Diese Umwandlung hat auf Erden schon begonnen, als eine Art *Wiedergeburt* aus dem Wasser und dem Geist (Joh 3, 5). Der Getaufte ist »aus Gott geboren« (Joh 1, 13), also Gottes Sohn, nicht gleich, aber doch ähnlich dem Gottessohn Christus. Das Ziel ist eine Umwandlung in Christus (Gal 4, 19). Die Idee der *Gotteskindschaft* ist sicherlich eine zentrale Glaubenswahrheit. Nun ist aber der Ausdruck »Gottessöhne« = »Götter« ein altes Synonym für die Engel (Iob 38, 7; Ps 82, 6 usw). Die Teilnahme an den Engeln kommt also auf eine Teilnahme an Gott hinaus, an *göttlicher Natur* (2Ptr 1, 4), ist sachlich damit identisch. Woher hat Petrus diese Weisheit? Man ist schnell bei der Hand, dafür die heidnische Philosophie haftbar zu machen (vgl. Apg 17, 28 Aratus). Dabei wird übersehen, daß die Hoffnung auf eine endzeitliche Verherrlichung im NT selbst tiefe Wurzeln hat (vgl. 1Ptr 4, 13; Rom 8, 17f). Gerade die spätere Theologie der griechischen Ostkirche war sehr interessiert an dem Gedanken der »Vergöttlichung« (θείωσις). »Der Grieche glaubt an die Möglichkeit einer Teilhabe des Menschen an der Gottheit«.[16] Der Römer glaubt natürlich auch daran. Während das alte römische Credo den Akzent legte auf Rechte und Pflichten, auf die Zugehörigkeit zur Kirche und Vergebung der Sünden, scheint unser Glaubensartikel darauf hinweisen zu wollen, daß die Rechtfertigung auch eine wichtige positive Seite hat in der Heiligung und Vergöttlichung. Schon Harnack hat die Vermutung ausgesprochen, daß in dem Zusatz »Gemeinschaft der Heiligen« griechischer Einfluß vorliegt: »Möglich ist auch, daß der Gedanke aus den Katechesen eines griechischen Kirchenvaters des 4. Jahrhunderts stammt und zuerst durch eine Art Zufall in ein Symbol gekommen ist« (aaO. 31).

Oben (S. 249) stellten wir fest, daß im NT meist Menschen, nämlich die Christen, »Heilige« genannt werden. Jetzt können wir auch sagen, warum das so ist: Nicht wegen ihrer hervorragenden Frömmigkeit oder sittlichen Vollkommenheit, sondern nur deshalb, weil sie den himmli-

schen Heiligen (= den Engeln) ähnlich sind, also weil sie an der Engelnatur Anteil haben. Genauer müßte man sagen: die »zu Heiligen Erhobenen«, die »Engel-Ähnlichen«. Im gleichen Sinne wagten die griechischen Kirchenväter zuweilen die Bezeichnung »Götter« für die von der heilig-machenden Gnade »vergöttlichten« Menschen.

Nachdem wir versucht haben, gleichsam von innen her die Herkunft unsres Glaubensartikels zu erhellen, kehren wir jetzt in seine Entstehungszeit um 400 zurück. Natürlich können wir nicht hoffen, apriori die Person des Interpolators festzustellen, aber wir versuchen, uns ein Bild zu machen, das uns bei der Suche helfen kann. Es muß ein Bischof oder ein Theologe von großer Autorität gewesen sein, denn kein unbekannter Laie hätte es wagen können, ein schon Jahrhunderte bestehendes öffentliches Taufsymbol zu verändern. Er muß Interesse gehabt haben an der Form des Taufsymbols, vielleicht Gelegenheit und Erfahrung, verschiedene Symbole zu vergleichen. Es muß ihm aufgefallen sein, daß dem alten römischen Symbol ein Mangel anhaftete, daß es korrekturbedürftig war. Er muß ein guter Kenner der apostolischen Tradition bzw. des biblischen Sprachgebrauchs gewesen sein, um diesen Mangel festzustellen, hatte vielleicht auch Vertrautheit mit östlicher, griechischer Theologie, die ihn auf diesen Mangel aufmerksam machte. Er muß schließlich ein Mann von großem Selbstbewußtsein, um nicht zu sagen Größenwahn, gewesen sein, wenn er meinte, sein Vorschlag müßte bei allen Bischöfen Anklang finden.

Nun hat uns der Zufall ein Dokument aufbewahrt, das zu all diesen Bedingungen ausgezeichnet paßt. Schon im Jahre 1904 veröffentlichte der bekannte Patrologe Germain Morin auf Grund von vier Handschriften (die älteste stammt aus dem 9. Jh.) ein Symbol mit dem Titel »Fides Sancti Hieronymi Presbyteri«.[17] Ich gebe eine wörtliche deutsche Übersetzung:

> Ich glaube an den einen Gott, den allmächtigen Vater (13.125),
> den Schöpfer sichtbarer und unsichtbarer Dinge (125).
> Ich glaube an den einen Herrn Jesus Christus,
> den Sohn Gottes (13.125),
> geboren aus Gott, Gott von Gott, Licht von Licht (125),
> allmächtigen von allmächtigem (Hahn §194),
> wahren Gott von wahrem Gott,
> vor Jahrhunderten geboren, nicht geschaffen (40.41.125),
> durch den alles geschaffen wurde im Himmel und auf Erden (125).
> Der um unsres Heiles willen vom Himmel herabstieg (125),
> empfangen aus dem Heiligen Geiste,

geboren aus Maria der Jungfrau (13.30),
[durch Leiden] gelitten unter Pontius Pilatus (13.125),
[unter dem König Herodes], gekreuzigt, begraben (13.125),
abgestiegen zur Unterwelt (Hahn §163.164.167)
[zertrat er den Stachel des Todes];
am dritten Tag auferstanden (13.125)
[erschien er den Aposteln].
[Danach] stieg er auf zum Himmel (13.125),
sitzet zur Rechten Gottes, des Vaters (13.125),
von dort zu kommen,
um zu richten die Lebenden und die Toten (13.125).
Ich glaube auch an den Heiligen Geist (13.21.29.125),
den weder ungezeugten noch gezeugten Gott,
nicht geschaffen noch gemacht (71; Hahn §189.200),
sondern gleich ewig mit dem Vater und dem Sohn (Hahn §189).
Ich glaube an die Vergebung der Sünden
in der heiligen katholischen Kirche (41),
[an die Gemeinschaft mit den Heiligen] (19),
an die Auferstehung des Fleisches zum ewigen Leben. Amen (41).

(die eingeklammerten Zahlen sind die Nummern des *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, DS [33]1965, wo eventuelle Quellen gefunden werden können; »Hahn« = A. Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole*, vgl. Anm. 5)

Stammt dieses Symbol[18] wirklich von Hieronymus? Der Herausgeber (Morin) hält es für möglich, aber er will sich nicht festlegen.[19] Wir fragen, erstens: War Hieronymus interessiert an Symbolen und ihrer Formulierung? Wie kein zweiter! Das erste theologische Werk, das ihm in die Hände fiel, war die Abhandlung des Hilarius von Poitiers »De Synodis seu de fide Orientalium« (359; neben dessen »Tractatus super Psalmos«, 365), eine »scharfsinnige, voll dokumentierte Übersicht über die zwischen 341 und 358 veröffentlichen Symbole«.[20] Das geschah während seines kurzen Aufenthalts in Trier, 369/370. Er kopierte es eigenhändig für seinen Freund Rufinus in Aquileja und sicherlich auch für sich selbst (falls er die Vorlage nicht fertig erworben hatte, denn er sammelte Bücher mit Leidenschaft). Das Werk enthält, neben dem Nizänischen Glaubensbekenntnis, die Symbole der Synoden von Antiochia (341), von Serdica/Philippopolis (343), und von Sirmium I (351). Es war die Zeit der semiarianischen Streitigkeiten, als die Kaiser noch an dogmatischen Fragen interessiert waren, und der kämpferische Geist des Hieronymus fand an diesen akuten Tagesfragen ein reiches Feld der Betätigung.

Zweitens: Hatte er selbst Gelegenheit und Anregung, ein eigenes

Glaubensbekenntnis aufzustellen? Darüber belehrt uns sein 17ter Brief, geschrieben 377 an einen befreundeten Presbyter Markus. Er hatte inzwischen Trier verlassen und befand sich auf einer Pilgerfahrt ins Heilige Land, die in Antiochia enden sollte. Dort kam er mit der griechisch und syrisch sprechenden Kirche des Ostens in Berührung, und es wurde ihm klar, daß er ohne Griechisch keine Theologie betreiben konnte. Um dies gründlich zu erlernen, schloß er sich den syrischen Eremiten der Chalkis (Wüste östlich von Antiochien) an. Jedoch dies Abenteuer endete mit einer großen Enttäuschung. Nach einiger Zeit merkten diese (die man sich durchaus nicht als engstirnige Fundamentalisten vorzustellen hat), daß sein westlich geprägter Glaube nicht ganz mit ihrem nizänischen Glauben übereinzustimmen schien. Einen sabellianischen Häretiker wollten sie unter keinen Umständen in ihrer Mitte dulden. Außerdem vermißten sie in seiner Spiritualität die Wärme und mystische Tiefe der Gottverbundenheit. Es kam zu peinlichen Inquisitionen, und Hieronymus sah ein, daß es besser wäre, nach Antiochia zurückzukehren. Aus dieser Situation ist der Brief 17 zu verstehen. Markus war wohl der einzige in seiner Umgebung, der einen lateinischen Brief und westliche Mentalität verstand. »Jeden Tag verlangen sie von mir ein Glaubenbekenntnis, als ob ich bei der Taufe keines abgelegt hätte. Aber was immer ich ihnen vorlege, läßt sie unbefriedigt.« Hieraus geht klar hervor, daß Hieronymus damals einen oder mehrere schriftliche Symbolentwürfe angefertigt hat, sicherlich zunächst auf Griechisch, denn seine Gastgeber verstanden kein Latein, worin er sich bemühte, die östliche Richtung (Nikaia, Jerusalem) neben der westlichen (Rom, Aquileja) zu Wort kommen zu lassen. Der Schwerpunkt des Verdachtes lag natürlich auf dem trinitarischen Teil. Außerdem erlaubte er sich einige extravagante Zusätze, denn er war ja nicht nach einer bestimmten Tradition gefragt worden, sondern nach seinem persönlichen Glauben. Sie bezeugen die bekannte Eigenwilligkeit des Hieronymus. Man darf also nicht fragen, welche Synode dieses Symbol aufgestellt hat oder wo es als Taufsymbol diente; es gehört zu den (von Hahn so benannten) »Privat-Symbolen«, mit denen Einzelne ihre Rechtgläubigkeit bezeugen wollten. Wie es kam, daß später dennoch (ohne Wissen und Willen des Hieronymus) einzelne Teile daraus in einem offiziellen Taufsymbol (AGb!) auftauchen konnten, ist eine andre Frage. Hieronymus hat jedenfalls seinen Entwurf an verschiedene Persönlichkeiten zur Begutachtung geschickt, z.B. an »den heiligen Cyrill«, womit doch zweifellos der berühmte Bischof von Jerusalem gemeint ist (Brief 17, Ende).

Zu diesen eigenwilligen Zusätzen,[21] gehört nun auch unser Zusatz *sanctorum communio* (man beachte die griechische Wortstellung: ἡ τῶν ἁγίων κοινωνία). Er ist der einzige, der vor 377 nirgendwo anders auftaucht (außer denen, die auch später nirgendwo Anklang fanden, wie z.B. »unter dem König Herodes«, vgl. Ignatius, Smyrn. 1, 2). Hieronymus wird ihn eingefügt haben, um den Eremiten entgegenzukommen, vielleicht auch weil er selbst einsah, daß seinem alten römischen Bekenntnis etwas Wichtiges fehlte, die innere Heiligung neben der Vergebung der Sünden (DS 1528.1561). Man konnte ihm vorwerfen: »Nachdem ihr im Geiste begonnen habt, wollt ihr im Fleische enden?« (Gal 3, 3). Den Schluß »Und an das ewige Leben« fand er bei Cyrill vor (DS 41).

Wie der Entwurf nach Remesiana gelangte, wissen wir nicht[22]. Vielleicht über Aquileja (Rufinus), jedenfalls nicht direkt von Hieronymus. Da kein Kommentar beigegeben war, wurde er sofort mißverstanden (s.o.). Ähnlich indirekt wird er in das Hauptverbreitungsgebiet, Südgallien, gelangt sein. Er war absichtlich als Unionssymbol konzipiert und konnte leicht von einer gallischen Bischofskonferenz auszugsweise adoptiert werden. Erst im 9. Jh., auf Betreiben Karls des Großen, gelangte er nach Rom und wurde dort dem reformierten AGb einverleibt. Seine Autorität als apostolisches Erbe verdankt er dem Ruf des inzwischen als Schriftgelehrten anerkannten Hieronymus.[23]

Mit dieser Annahme lösen sich alle Rätsel der *sanctorum communio* mit einem Schlage. Sie ist kein überflüssiges Anhängsel zur »heiligen Kirche«, sondern ein vollwertiger Glaubensartikel. Ihre griechische Färbung als Übersetzung von κοινωνία erklärt sich aus der einmaligen Situation des Hieronymus, der sich genötigt sah, seinen Glauben auf griechisch zu formulieren (das er selbst noch nicht vollkommen beherrschte). Daß die Formel erst Sinn ergibt, wenn man biblischen Wortgebrauch voraussetzt (»Heilige« = Engel), kommt von der Bibel-Belesenheit ihres Urhebers und seiner Absicht, den apostolischen Glauben wiederzugeben. Es lag ihm fern, das Taufsymbol der Kirche reformieren zu wollen. Er wollte nur seinen Eremiten zeigen, daß er persönlich ihr Anliegen ernst nahm und den Zusatz als objektive Verbesserung ansah. Den unerwarteten Erfolg seines Vorschlags hat er nicht mehr erlebt. Hätte er eine offizielle Verbesserung des Apostolicum ernstlich in Erwägung gezogen, so hätte er sich in Rom (Damasus!) darum bemüht. Nicht Niketas von Remesiana, sondern Hieronymus ist mit seiner *Fides Hieronymi* der älteste Zeuge und der Urheber des Glaubensartikels, was inzwischen auch mehr und mehr anerkannt wird.[24]

So ist also die »Gemeinschaft der Heiligen« durch Zufall in das Glaubensbekenntnis geraten und hat dort, mißverstanden, allerlei Unheil angerichtet. Sie könnte aber nachträglich als ökumenisches Bindeglied zwischen Ost und West gute Dienste leisten.

ANMERKUNGEN

[1] »Herkunft und Bedeutung von *sanctorum communionem* sind sehr umstritten«, F.K. Vokes, in *TRE* 3 (1978), 550.

[2] Vgl. *DS*[33] (1965), S. 20: »Hodie constat antiquissimam *Symboli Apostolici* formam nobis notam non ultra ultima saeculi II decennia reduci posse« (A. Schönmetzer).

[3] Adolf Harnack, *Das Apostolische Glaubensbekenntnis*, [2-7]1896.

[4] Ambrosius, *Explanatio Symboli*, PL 17, 1193-1196. Symboltext: DS 13. Abweichung vom obigen Text beschränkt sich auf Art. 4: »unter Pontius Pilatus gelitten, gestorben und begraben«. Die Zählung ist künstlich an die Zahl der Apostel angeglichen. Man hätte leicht noch mehr Glaubensartikel aufstellen können, z.B. Ich glaube an Jesu Taufe im Jordan, an die Einsetzung der Eucharistie, an die Heilige Schrift, usw.

[5] Zuerst bei Rufinus um 404, im Taufsymbol von Aquileja, vgl. seine *Expositio in Symbolum* (um 404), *DS* 16; ist aber schon in dem semiarianischen Symbol der Synode von Konstantinopel (360) enthalten, siehe A. Hahn (ed.), *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der Alten Kirche* 1962 (1897), §167.

[6] Bei den Griechen findet sich der Zusatz früher, vgl. das Credo der Katechesen Cyrills von Jerusalem (um 348): καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον«, *DS* 41.

[7] *DS* 26: Faustus von Riez (um 450-480); *DS* 27: Caesarius von Arles († 543); *DS* 28: Pirminius von Reichenau (8. Jh.)

[8] Katholisch: vgl. die Bibliographie bei Antonio Piolanti, *Il Mistero della Communione dei Santi* (1957), S. IX-XIV. Protestantisch: vgl. D. Bonhoeffer, *Sanctorum Communio*, 1927. Ferner, *RE* VI (1899) Art. Gem.d.Heiligen, von J. Köstlin. Die neue *TRE* führt den Titel nicht mehr.

[9] Vgl. den Untertitel von Dietrich Bonhoeffers Dissertation: »Dogmatische Untersuchung zur Soziologie der Kirche«.

[10] Vgl. die von Augustinus zitierten donatistischen Texte, z.B. PL 36, 379: »Quod incestos cum sanctorum communione miscuerit« (um 393).

[11] Vgl. Vokes, aaO. 550,26f.; daselbst spätere Belege. — Besonders Werner Elert hat sich für dieses »sächliche Verständnis« der Formel eingesetzt, vgl. »Die Herkunft der Formel Sanctorum communio«, in *TheolLitz.* 74 (1949), 577-586.

[12] aaO. 17 und 31: »Am dunkelsten ist die Entstehung und der ursprüngliche Sinn des Zusatzes 'Gemeinschaft der Heiligen'«. Inkonsequent scheint es, wenn er dann doch zwei Deutungen vorschlägt (S. 31): Entweder »die Gemeinschaft der wahrhaft Gläubigen (Heiligen) auf Erden«, oder »die Gemeinschaft mit den vollendeten Heiligen«, womit wahrscheinlich die Verstorbenen gemeint sind.

[13] 13 mal: Dt 33,3 (Text unsicher); Iob 5,1; 15,15; Ps 89, 6.8; Prov 9,10; 30,3; Zach 14,5; Dan 4,14; 7,18; Sap 10,10; Sir 42,17; Dazu noch die Konjektur Ex 15,11 (lg. *qdošsim*). Davon zweimal (Dt 33,3 und Iob 15,15) mit dem Possessivsuffix Gottes: »seine (Jahwes) Heiligen«. Die Ausnahmen sind z.T. nur scheinbar: z.B. Ps 34,10 »Fürchtet den Herrn,

ihr seine Heiligen« muß heißen »die ihr ihn sucht« (lg. *doršâw*); vgl. M. Noth, »Die Heiligen des Höchsten«, in: *Mowinckel-FS* 1955, 146-161.

[14] J. Gnilka, *Kolosserbrief*, HThK X, 1 (1980).

[15] 1Kor 1,9: »Anteilnahme an seinem Sohn Jesus Christus«; 2Kor 13,13: »Anteilnahme am Heiligen Geiste«; Phil 2,1 »Wenn es eine Anteilnahme am Geiste gibt ...«

[16] Vgl. H. Schlier, »Die ἅγιοι sind nach atl.-jüdischem Sprachgebrauch hier (Eph 1,18) und 2,19; 3,18, vgl. 1Thess 3,13 wahrscheinlich Engel«, *Epheser-Kommentar* (1957) S.84.

[17] P. Neuenzeit, in *LThK* VI, 368, Art. Koinonia.

[18] »Un symbole inédit attribué à Saint Jérôme«, in: *Revue Bénédictine* 21 (1904), 1-9. Nicht zu verwechseln mit einer gleichnamigen, aber völlig abweichenden, »Fides Hieronymi Presbyteri«, die 1934 von J.A. de Aldama publiziert wurde, in: *El Simbolo Toledano I*, 1934, S.148-150. Aldama setzt diese auf 381 an, hält sie aber für unecht (aaO. 88).

[19] »Rien n'empêche, qu'elle ne soit aussi ancienne que Jérôme«, aaO. 9.

[20] Vgl. J.N.D. Kelly, *Jerome. His Life, Writings and Controversies*, London 1975, S.28.

[21] Die nicht unbedingt ein besonders hohes Alter der Tradition bezeugen, wie Morin (aaO.5 und 8) meinte.

[22] Niketas zeigt zwar, — der Herausgeber macht mich freundlicherweise darauf aufmerksam — daß er um einen Zusammenhang mit den Engeln weiß, denn er sagt: »Auch die Engel sind mit dieser einen Kirche verbündet (*confoederantur*, aaO.)«. Aber das besagt nicht, daß die Engel an etwas typisch Menschlichem (am Alten oder Neuen Bund) teilhaben. Vielmehr erhalten die Menschen aus Gnade Anteil an typisch engelhaften Privilegien (Unsterblichkeit, Visio beatifica).

[23] Ähnlich scheint es dem Glaubensartikel »Abgefahren zur Unterwelt« ergangen zu sein, der zwar seit 359 schon aus semiarianischen Synodalsymbolen bekannt war (vgl. Anm.5), aber seine Autorität erst aus der Erwähnung in der »Fides Hieronymi« bezog.

[24] »Die Formel erscheint gegen Ende des 4.Jh. (ältester Beleg bei Hieronymus; s.G. Morin ...)«, W. Popkes in *RAC* 9 (1976), 1142.

4-32-11 Kami-Shakujii, Nerima-ku, Tokyo 177, Japan

Vigiliae Christianae 47 (1993), 260-280, E. J. Brill, Leiden

COMPUTER AND HOMILY: ACCESSING THE EVERYDAY LIFE OF EARLY CHRISTIANS*

BY

PAULINE ALLEN AND WENDY MAYER

Introduction

Homilies from the first centuries of the Christian church survive in their thousands in several ancient languages. Since in the course of their preaching the homilists often entertained as well as edified the congregation, these homilies are frequently couched in folkloristic terms and are consequently more spontaneous than much of the formal and official ecclesiastical and secular literature of the period. Early Christian homilies thus reflect situations of everyday life and the social and religious thought-world of ordinary people. Furthermore, it can be argued that in early Christianity the homily was the main bearer of culture and was fundamental to the transmission of norms in society. Again, since homilies, like liturgies, are an urban phenomenon and representative of local urban regions,[1] they are *prima facie* essential sources for determining *local* social and private norms. Yet a systematic exploration of this material has never been attempted. There are many reasons for this, but three factors are paramount. Firstly, the size of the corpus is daunting, its bulk proving the popularity of the homily and the frequency of preaching in the early church. From one single homilist of the period, albeit the most famous one, John Chrysostom, we have about a thousand homilies, surviving either whole or in part. Secondly, there are frequent problems of authenticity or attribution, caused chiefly by the fact that a large number of homilies has been transmitted under the names of renowned homilists like John Chrysostom, but do not belong to them at all. Thirdly, the immensity of the corpus has resulted in some unedited or poorly edited texts, which preclude or hinder systematic analysis of their contents.[2]

Despite such obstacles, however, it is self-evident that we should not allow the wealth of information contained in these homilies to remain

largely unaccessed, particularly given the contemporary preoccupation with social history and with the transmission of knowledge in society. In addition, if we are in search of lived Christianity or "practical divinity" in these early centuries, or if our concern is with the social extension of Patristics,[3] we must start with the homily.

It is remarkable that the overall treatment of early Christian preaching by Joseph Bingham (d. 1723) received a successor only in 1991, in an important study by Alexander Olivar.[4] We do not, however, pretend that in the meantime the underexploitation of early homiletic material was total. The magisterial three volume work of Albert Ehrhard, who at great personal cost investigated the manuscript tradition of a great deal of homiletic and hagiographic literature, must be mentioned here.[5] In the past two decades, too, several studies have appeared in which homilies figure as an important source for research into aspects of social history or liturgy.[6] Text editions of homilies, with translations and notes are being published at regular intervals by the series *Sources Chrétiennes*.[7] Only recently, too, we have seen the appearance of a detailed study of Chrysostom's Homilies on the Statues.[8] But the point is rather that if so much can be revealed through only incidental use of certain homiletic texts, what can one hope for by systematically accessing homilies for the material they contain on the everyday life of early Christians?

Thanks to a three year grant from the Australian Research Council (1991-1993), we now have the chance to begin exploring early homiletic literature in a systematic way, the aim of the project being to unlock the contents of this corpus and to use it as a source in its own right. Since the corpus is so vast, and because of evidence of local traditions within it, it was practicable to divide the material according to geographical areas in the early Christian world. The first phase of the project involves the analysis of homilies from Constantinople during the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries, chiefly those of John Chrysostom (d.407), Proclus, patriarch of Constantinople from 434-446, and the presbyter Leontius (c.550). The homilies concerned are read closely and systematically for the information which they contain on the everyday life of the Christians who heard them delivered, and the data thus gleaned is integrated with data already available from other sources and disciplines, such as secular and ecclesiastical works of the period, and archaeological and epigraphic evidence. In subsequent phases of the project we hope that the same approach will be adopted for locations such as Antioch, Jerusalem, North Africa and Italy.

While reading the homilies in this manner is slow and painstaking work, it is also productive. In fact, such is the plethora of details which is divulged that it can be coped with only by a database, and here it needs to be stressed that the computer is not simply an indispensible tool but precisely the enabling factor of the whole project. The database has been designed with two key factors in mind—the likelihood of collaboration by researchers with varying degrees of both computer literacy and computer hardware and software; and the swift obsolescence of current computer software and technology. Where the average computer and its software is superseded every two to three years, the project will, it is hoped, extend well beyond this limit.[9]

In order to convey an idea both of the types of information which a close and systematic reading of the early Christian homily reveals, and of the impact of the homily on the lives of its hearers, we shall consider (i) early preaching in its urban context and (ii) the homily in the setting of the liturgy and of liturgical development. In the main, given our current concentration on this area, we shall confine our comment to the city of Constantinople, and in particular to the homilies of John Chrysostom.

Early preaching in its urban context

The vast majority of the homilies which have come down to us from early Christian times were delivered by preachers who worked in an urban environment. There was considerable variation from district to district concerning who was entitled to preach, but it is clear that the primary function of a bishop, together with ordination, was the continual instruction of the faithful, particularly by means of the homily.[10] In fact the legal codes enjoined on bishops the duty of preaching the word of God.[11] However, while in North Africa and Egypt the office of preaching was vested in the bishop alone, in other areas, such as Constantinople, presbyters (priests) and even occasionally deacons, were permitted to preach. When a presbyter delivered the homily, it was customary for the bishop to preach afterwards as well, but it is not clear whether this was an absolute rule. On certain feasts or during vigils, it was possible for a series of homilists to speak, a practice which must have affected the length of these homilies.[12]

If more than one homily could be delivered on a particular liturgical occasion, how frequently were the faithful edified by their homilists?

Here again we must make allowances for local variation and for the fact that the eucharistic liturgy itself was celebrated on different days and with varying frequency in the week in areas of the early Christian world.[13] Daily homilies were preached in Lent, at both eucharistic and non-eucharistic liturgies, as testified, for example, by a series of homilies preached in Antioch by John Chrysostom on the Book of Genesis,[14] and of Hesychius of Jerusalem on the Book of Job.[15] In Holy Week in Constantinople during the sixth century the presbyter Leontius appears to have preached in the evening on the Book of Job.[16] Caesarius of Arles is said by his biographer to have delivered a homily nearly every day at both morning and evening prayer.[17]

While the urban Christian had considerable choice of church and preacher, the frequency of preaching in country areas was not high, as Chrysostom explains:

> Those who dwell in the cities enjoy continual instruction, whereas those who live in the country do not share in such abundance. Therefore God relieved the lack of teachers by a profusion of martyrs and ordained that more martyrs be buried near them (in the country). They do not hear the tongues of teachers without ceasing, but the voices of martyrs speaking to them from their graves and being more forceful.[18]

While in theory we could distinguish at least six different types of homilies: exegetical, polemical, exhortative, panegyrical (on saints and martyrs), homilies for particular times, occasions and feasts, and homilies on particular doctrines and moral subjects,[19] very often we encounter homilies of a mixed kind, where, for example, after expounding on a particular scriptural text, the preacher proceeds to edify the congregation concerning their values and morals. To what they heard from their homilist's lips, the faithful reacted in various ways. While it has recently been argued that the clapping of hands was a practice frowned on in the early church,[20] it is obvious from comments made by the homilists themselves in the course of their preaching that their hearers expressed approval or disapproval at least both facially and verbally.[21] For instance, the sixth century presbyter Leontius was apparently prevented by his bored flock from proceeding to treat a point of ancient exegesis concerning the apostle John.[22] Not infrequently we find the homilist referring to the surprise or anger which his words have evoked in his hearers. At one point during his preaching on Paul's letter to the Philippians, John Chrysostom acknowledges that the congregation do not like what they are hearing, but he advises them that

it is better to burn for a short time from his words than to burn in hell forever.[23]

This gives rise to questions concerning the manner in which these homilies were delivered. From what we have just pointed out concerning the remarks of the homilist about the reaction of the congregation, we have to posit some degree of extempore delivery.[24] However, the oratorical skills of the early homilists also enabled them to preach an entire homily extempore, as the church historian Sozomen tells us that Chrysostom did.[25] When the mode of delivery was extempore, it was customary for stenographers to take down the text of the homily, which was then preserved for posterity.[26] The fact that after Chrysostom's death his notes for a series of homilies on Paul's letter to the Hebrews were redacted by a presbyter may indicate that this renowned orator also preached from notes.[27] Yet other homilies were polished pieces written down by the homilist beforehand, as the case of Severian of Gabala illustrates. The church historian Socrates relates how, on hearing of the fortune which a presbyter from Phoenicia had made by preaching in Constantinople, Severian practised the delivery of a collection of homilies which he had composed, then set off to the capital to make his money as well.[28]

The urban environment determined both how and what the homilist preached. As a good orator, the effective homilist pitched his sermon to the social level and cultural background of his congregation, using what was familiar and easily accessible to the majority to get his message across.[29] Generating interest from the point of view of his urban hearers and striving constantly to entertain and please as well as to instruct was of fundamental concern to the early homilist. Consequently the early homily is a potentially valuable source for information on a number of levels about local and contemporary urban society.

The sheer breadth and range of social information that can be derived from data which is seemingly disparate or trivial can be illustrated from some of the homilies which John Chrysostom delivered in Constantinople between the years 397-404.[30] In the course of demonstrating that Moses was the teacher, nurse and pedagogue par excellence, the homilist reveals how nurses toilet train children;[31] to exemplify true peace of mind, he adduces the example of children in boats, who are terrified by the movement of the water, whereas the helmsman remains seated, motionless, and laughs at their terror.[32] To engage the interest of the congregation, Chrysostom makes considerable reference to disease, its

treatment, and to the medical profession, including a case where pessaries for the cure of infertility were administered to an emperor's wife with fatal results.[33] There is reference to various trades, their tools and various trade practices, military concerns and practices, the role and function of ambassador, and the sometimes complex ritual of imperial protocol. Given that Chrysostom, like other homilists, often preached in the very shadow of the major urban entertainment centres such as the stadium and the circus, sport, athletes and chariot racing feature continually in his homilies. Several times during the course of his preaching in Antioch (386-397) he had complained about the tendency of his listeners to end up at the races when they were supposed to be in church.[34] In his Constantinopolitan homilies he remarks on the types of entertainment which appear in the theatre, the social classes involved and their dress and behaviour. There is reference to prostitution, the social background of the prostitutes themselves and the professional and social standing of their clients.[35] When we add to this the numerous citations of what people tend to say in a given situation, as well as the frequent comment on the attitudes and feelings of the audience, certain sectors of society or society in general, we have a great deal of information about the speech habits and value systems of the society in the midst of which Chrysostom laboured.

A particular concern of John Chrysostom in Constantinople is the excess and the ostentation of the rich and the would-be rich in his urban congregation, and their snobbish disdain of the poor.[36] He heaps opprobrium on the elaborate and lengthy preparations made by the well-to-do for the lavish meals to which they invite people of like kind, preparations which rob them for days beforehand of their peace of mind as they discuss plans with butchers, pastrycooks and tablesetters.[37] At these meals, which last until evening,[38] stylishly clad guests eat and drink from gold and silver vessels as they recline around a semi-circular table so heavy that two attendants can scarcely move it, while they are waited on by a multitude of servants.[39] Elsewhere the homilist launches a particularly vitriolic attack on those who use chamberpots made out of beaten silver, those who have houses adorned with gold halls, and chairs and footstools made of solid silver. The next absurdity, he warns, will be gold hair, gold lips and gold eyebrows.[40] And meanwhile there are beggars standing around the church who do not have even bread.[41] Chrysostom often condemns the ostentatious dress of his congregation, at one point deriding their persistence in sweating through summer in

trousers, tunic, belt and two or three short cloaks,[42] at another their practice of wearing gold jewellery even in the baths.[43] He rails against his female listeners who adorn themselves with gold and clothing, the extravagance of which suits actors, acrobats and those who fight wild animals.[44] Again, addressing himself to the women in his congregation, he denounces avarice by using the example of a woman who owns a dress woven with gold: she shakes it, folds it up in linen cloths, worries about it, and does not enjoy her possession. Many homes hoard such expensive clothing, accuses Chrysostom, which is honoured like a human master.[45] From the homilist's comments it is evident that excesses were also being perpetrated in the city in respect of private housing, for he admonishes his listeners to be content with a dwelling of three rooms, which he judges sufficient for husband, wife and two children.[46] Similarly, he warns them that two servants are enough for one family, and ridicules those who promenade through Constantinople with an entourage of attendants.[47] Just as ridiculous are those men who ride in public with their horses decorated with gold jewellery or trappings indistinguishable, so the homilist maintains, from what their wives wear.[48]

The culpability of the well-to-do with regard to excess and ostentation is compounded by their snobbish disdain of the poor. Among the impoverished clearly are widows, the aged, the crippled and mutilated, as well as the disinherited and the dispossessed. Chrysostom enjoins his congregation to give alms to such people, alleging that society treats them worse than dogs or slaves.[49] His affluent listeners apparently excused themselves from acts of charity on the grounds that beggars were imposters, an imputation which Chrysostom refutes roundly. Poverty, he points out, has nothing to do with being an imposter, but is caused by shipwreck, legal suits, theft, natural disasters and sickness.[50] On another occasion he reproves his flock for the lack of respect shown to the poor, as evidenced by the mugging of a beggar.[51]

Unpalatable as these admonitions must have been to many people in Chrysostom's congregation in Constantinople, they provide us with precious insights into the daily life and the value systems of an early Christian urban community. In time, the systematic accumulation and analysis of such data will help us to construct a more coherent picture of the society in which such Christians lived. The difficulty of keeping track of the innumerable pieces of information which the homilies divulge has caused us to create in our database no less than eight main

categories and fifty-two subcategories so far, the latter being a number which almost certainly will increase as we proceed with the project.

Liturgy in its urban context and the early homily

Of these fifty-two subcategories, seven—prayer, scripture, liturgy, ecclesiastical administration, martyrs, hagioi and monachoi—relate in one way or another to the celebration of the liturgy. There is a particular reason for this. For in the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries, the period which is at the focus of this project, the day-to-day secular life and the public spiritual life of the early Christian urban community are intimately connected.[52]

We shall examine the nature of this relationship in a moment. But first we must ask what it is about early Christian preaching which makes it a useful purveyor of liturgical detail. Two factors are significant. The first is the historic connection between the homily and the Service of the Word. Developing out of the ritual associated with the Jewish synagogues, by the fourth century the Service of the Word had attained a structure centred around the reading of selected passages of scripture. These readings were to some degree interpreted in an accompanying homily which usually formed the climax of this section of the liturgy. While structurally the Service of the Word developed entirely separate from the Liturgy of the Eucharist, it was often celebrated together with the latter, in which instance the uninitiated were dismissed shortly after the homilist had preached.[53] The early homily, as we can see, is in itself an important element of the liturgy. Its function is primarily hermeneutical and this draws it close to the lections which precede.[54] At the very least, in examining one of these homilies, we would hope to elicit information concerning one or more of the lections chosen for the occasion.[55] By the same token, the proximity of the homily to the close of the Service of the Word makes it an excellent candidate for incidental comment both upon other elements within this liturgy and upon those which may follow in the celebration of the Eucharist.[56] The actual situation of the early homily within the liturgy, then, makes it a useful purveyor of certain limited types of information.

Information about the status of liturgical structure and content which can be elicited is only a small example of the range of liturgical data that the early homily can provide. As we have mentioned above, the primary duty of the homilist was to instruct his audience. This brings us to the

second aspect of the early homily which is significant. As we have already pointed out, the need to generate interest from his jaded urban hearers led the early homilist to strive constantly to entertain and please as well as to instruct. This popular element provides for not only a great deal of useful social information, as we have detailed above. It also incidentally provides liturgical information of a kind hitherto largely unexplored. This is information not about the static and persistent formal elements of the liturgy which have changed little with time, but about the day-to-day implementation of these at the local urban level. The very immediacy of the homiletic medium allows us access to the historic moment at which this local worship was taking place. "Yesterday", says Chrysostom the day after the transferral of Saint Phocas' relics to Constantinople, "our city was radiant, radiant and worthy of note, not because it has columns, but because a martyr who was being conveyed with ceremony to us from Pontus arrived." Shortly after, he continues:

> Were you absent yesterday? Then be present today, that you may see him led off to his own resting place. Did you see him [yesterday] being led through the agora? See him also sailing through the sea, so that both elements may be filled with his blessing. Let no-one be absent from this holy festival. Let no girl remain at home, let no woman keep to the confines of the house; let us empty the city and set out together for the martyr's tomb. For even their imperial majesties are as one with us as they lead the procession. What excuse, then, does the private citizen have, when their majesties quit the imperial halls and seat themselves beside the tomb of the martyr?[57]

Here we find detail not of liturgical formulae, but of liturgical action—ritual behaviour shaped by and in harmony with a highly individual and specific urban topography. The liturgical exploitation of both land and sea,[58] indeed the importation of relics in itself, is a circumstance quite foreign to Chrysostom's experience at Antioch.

As we can see from the above, the day-to-day secular life and the public spiritual life of the early Christian community at Constantinople are intimately connected. The *basileus* and *basilissa* themselves are participants.[59] This circumstance automatically involves the *dorophoroi* and other members of the imperial retinue.[60] In his admonition to both girls and married women to leave their homes, Chrysostom clearly expects society in its fullest spectrum to participate.[61] This is, moreover, the second day of the festivities.[62] Two homilies have been delivered on

successive days—the first, as is likely, after a procession conveying the relics to the church where they presently rest.[63] A second procession, distinct from the occasion at which Chrysostom is preaching, is yet to take place.[64] This involves boats and, with a spectacular display of lights out on the water, is to take place after dark.[65] The final resting place of the martyr is outside the limits of the city, most likely at a church or martyrium in the suburbs.[66] The sheer disruption of everyday social and commercial activity caused by festivity on such a scale, given that on the first day the procession passed through the central business district, suggests that every person in the city must in some way have been affected.[67]

The process through which early liturgy is shaped by, and in turn shapes, its local urban milieu is currently receiving greater recognition throughout the field of liturgical scholarship.[68] In this same vein, the homilies of Chrysostom tell us of worship at a bilingual church at Constantinople,[69] detail ceremonial associated with individual churches and martyria throughout Constantinople,[70] and provide evidence of the use of a religious image in a church at the time of year celebrating the Maccabean martyrs.[71] The visual details contained in the passage adduced above in themselves provide clues to a dimension of the liturgy to which we otherwise have little access.[72] Clearly, the details of everyday social and liturgical life in the early Christian community are intimately connected. These, in turn, are firmly tied to the peculiarities of the local urban milieu. A careful and systematic study of the early Christian homilies has much to provide in improving our knowledge of these relationships.

Conclusion

In focussing here on aspects of the early homily in its urban context we have hoped to convey both the centrality of the homily to the life of the ancient church, and the potential and importance of this homiletic corpus as a source, at the same time demonstrating how it needs to be studied systematically, in context, and in its own right, rather than being pillaged incidentally for data. The role of the database in storing and retrieving the bounteous information offered by this corpus cannot be stressed enough. But using the computer to process this material does not simply enable us to access the desired information contained in homiletic literature: it allows us to integrate our

systematically acquired data with that already available from other sources and disciplines, and eventually to offer a more responsible and coherent picture of the temporal and spiritual concerns of the early church.

Appendix

The first column of the database employs eight sigla which denote the main categories into which information is divided. The following demonstrates the process by which these sigla were selected.

I = Imperial. This includes all material relating to the *basileus* and members of the royal family, all aspects of the palace and palace life (such as architecture, administration, eunuchs, processions and protocol) and foreign policy.

A = Administrative. This includes all material relating to the administrative, economic, legal and military aspects of the empire outside of the immediate circle of the *basileus* (administrative and military personnel, military hardware and logistics, taxation, legal documents and proceedings etc.). Reference to the general concept of *arche* is also included.

S = Social. This category includes all aspects of day-to-day life outside of the realms that are strictly defined as imperial, ecclesiastical, administrative or private. It covers most of the subcategories contained in the second column (trades, medicine, entertainment, travel, crime, education, architecture, commerce, etc.). Because of the broad range of information which falls under this category, it is kept strictly limited to information which is specific and provides factual detail. All material which would normally be considered 'social', but is of a purely general nature is placed under the category 'W'.

P = Private. This includes all material relating to the private sphere (such as household members and contents, social interaction within the household, children, slaves, clothing, hospitality).

L = Literary. This category has nothing to do with "literature" per se (for which see W). It refers strictly to material which provides information about preacher and audience (references to length of homily, time, audience posture, audience composition—particularly in terms of social status and gender). Comments which are clearly rhetorical are not included. The category also includes any quotation or imitation of common speech patterns made by the homilist.

H = Historical. This category covers all reference to historical events (civil war, barbarian incursion, death in the imperial family etc.) and to significant natural phenomena (such as comets, eclipses, earthquakes, fires, hail storms, plague).
E = Ecclesiastical. This incorporates all aspects of church life (offices, administration, use of scripture, church architecture and furnishings, liturgy, ecclesiastical law, tithing, attitudes toward heretics, pagans and Jews etc.). Eremites, holy men and women, and the interaction between these and the laity are also included.
W = Weltanschauung. This category brings together all material that cannot strictly be defined as factual. In particular, it includes all material which defines the common thought-world or mode of perception of the audience. This includes assumed value systems, modes of social interaction, behavioural norms and scientific beliefs. It also includes the assumed literary background of the audience and/or society, and the use made by the homilist of Old and New Testament exempla. Material which relates to factual aspects of the society, but which is not directly stated or must be inferred from negative statements, is listed under this category. Where information is stated with ambiguity or where there is doubt about the interpretation of information, it is likewise included.

The second column of the database employs a list of subcategories (currently fifty-two) which can be expanded according to need. These subcategories are used to define further the nature of the information which is recorded. Their selection has been influenced largely by a reading of the homilies themselves and an attempt to provide a number of keywords by which information might be usefully searched for and collated.

The following extract demonstrates how the information is recorded. The first five columns indicate main category, subcategory, individual label, author-text and PG identification. The sixth column provides a brief summary of the information.

W military	aristeus	chr col.1 62,300 25-24 ai		victorious warrior image (trophies & slaughter) = Paul writing letters in prison
E liturgy	lection	chr col.1 62,301 6-7		comment on use of 'dia' at Col.1.1, implying homilies

				on epistle with same opening within recent memory
S	plants	growth	chr col.1 62,302 21-23	plants become stronger/more dense (pykna) when firmly set (sterizein)
W	behaviour	philia	chr col.1 62,303 2-19	social versus natural/biological amicitia; latter seems stronger, but often friends prove truer than brothers/ sons
W	behaviour	hospitality	chr col.1 62,303 5-6	social amicitia through having shared a table, 'kala'
W	behaviour	travel	chr col.1 62,303 5-6	social amicitia through having shared a journey, 'kala'
S	trades	philia	chr col.1 62,303 7-8	social amicitia through being fellow tradesmen, not perfect, involves envy and slander
P	household	philia	chr col.1 62,303 9-12	father-son, son-father, grandfather-grandson, mother-children; wife-husband social, not biological
W	women	mother	chr col.1 62,303 9-11	mother-children relationship part of natural/biological amicitia
W	women	wife	chr col.1 62,303 11-13	wife-husband relationship, all marital relationships part of social amicitia
W	palace	basilissa	chr col.1 62,303 20-22	image of queen/empress resplendant in appearance controll-

			ing her private affairs, above social/biological norms
W women	basilissa	chr col.1 62,303 20-22	image of queen/empress radiant in appearance controlling her private affairs
W household	father	chr col.1 62,303 29-30	no-one would request of a father that they be among evils
W household	mother	chr col.1 62,303 33-34	no mother would choose to ignore her own situation and say, while it was better to die, others made it ess. to stay
W women	mother	chr col.1 62,303 33-34	no mother would choose to ignore her own situation and say, while it was better to die, others made it ess. to stay
W behaviour	philia	chr col.1 62,303 36-51	dynamics of amicitia, particularly the factors which dissolve it, amicitia based on good fortune and propinquity
P household	father	chr col.1 62,303 36-37	the father who's been ill-treated/abused gives up the amicitia/relationship
P household	wife	chr col.1 62,303 43-45	should conflict occur, the wife divorces the husband
W women	wife	chr col.1 62,303 43-45	should conflict occur, the wife

						divorces the husband
A	law	divorce	chr	col.1	62,303 43-45	passage appears to suggest women have the legal option of divorce
P	household	inheritance	chr	col.1	62,303 45-46	if the son sees the father living overlong, he is annoyed/depressed
W	travel	philia	chr	col.1	62,303 47-48	length of journey cited as a cause for the dissolution of an amicitia (Latin reads 'length of life')
W	OT exempla	Moses	chr	col.1	62,303 51-52	example of spiritual amicitia, when subject to stoning made a request on their behalf
W	household	father	chr	col.1	62,303 52-54	on being stoned, a father would, rather than assist the perpetrator, stone him to death
W	behaviour	hospitality	chr	col.1	62,303 55-56	amicitia resulting from hospitality not strong or unbreakable
L	audience	hospitality	chr	col.1	62,304 3-5	audience would rather excuse themselves than be obliged to dine as guests together with the blind and lame
L	audience	values	chr	col.1	62,304 3-5	audience would rather excuse themselves than be obliged to dine as guests together with the blind and lame
S	medicine	phys. disability	chr	col.1	62,304 3-4	reference to blindness and physical disability in the form of being crippled/ lame

W poverty	phys. disability	chr col.1 62,304 3-10	implied link between blindness, lameness, acquired physical disability (not result of disease?) and poverty
W behaviour	hospitality	chr col.1 62,304 8-9	'friends' (philoi) a focus of hospitality, with resultant benefits
W values	poverty	chr col.1 62,304 3-10	association with the poor and disabled of no social or material benefit, prospect of interaction therewith distasteful
W values	hospitality	chr col.1 62,304 11-12	provision of hospitality creates indebtedness, failure of the recipient to fulfil the obligation causes distress
W behaviour	hospitality	chr col.1 62,304 15-20	hospitality an investment, extended to those capable of providing a return (philoi)
W hospitality	—	chr col.1 62,304 18-20	when a 'friend' (philos) invited, occasion lasts till evening; considerable financial outlay implied
W poverty	hygiene	chr col.1 62,304 24-29	poor personal hygiene, clothing filthy
P clothing	—	chr col.1 62,304 27-29	to make the poor man an acceptable dinner companion, change his dirty clothes (himatia) for a clean robe (stole)

NOTES

* A short preliminary version of the first section of this article was the subject of a paper delivered by Pauline Allen at the Eleventh International Conference on Patristic Studies, Oxford, 19-24 August 1991, forthcoming in *Studia Patristica*. The research for the present paper was financed by the Australian Research Council.

[1] On this fact see T. J. Talley, *Origins of the Liturgical Year*, New York 1986, passim; 2nd revised ed. Collegeville 1991, and J. F. Baldovin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship: The Origins, Development and Meaning of Stational Liturgy*, Rome 1987 (OCA 228).

[2] For other problems, in this case restricted to the Greek tradition, see M. Cunningham, "Preaching and the Community", in: R. Morris (ed.), *Church and People in Byzantium* (Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies. Twentieth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Manchester, 1986), Birmingham 1990, 29-47.

[3] The phrase is that of C. Kannengiesser, "The Future of Patristics", *TS* 52 (1991) 128-139.

[4] *Origines Ecclesiasticae; or the Antiquities of the Christian Church*, XIV.iv. There are several editions of this work. The edition used here appeared in 8 vols revised by Richard Bingham, London 1834. A. Olivar, *La predicación cristiana antigua*, Barcelona 1991 (Sección de teología y filosofía, vol. 189).

[5] *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 16.Jahrhunderts*, I-III, Leipzig 1937-1952 (TU 50-52).

[6] Examples are H. Berthold, "Frühe christliche Literatur als Quelle für Sozialgeschichte", in: J. Irmscher/K. Treu (edd.), *Das Korpus der Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller. Historie, Gegenwart, Zukunft*, Berlin 1977 (TU 120), 43-63; R. L. Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews; Rhetoric and Reality in the Late Fourth Century*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1983; the article by J. C. B. Petropoulos, "The Church Father as Social Informant: St. John Chrysostom on folk-songs", *Studia Patristica* XXII (1989) 159-164; R. MacMullen, "The preacher's audience (AD 350-400)", *JThS* NS 40 (1989) 503-511; and P. Brown on *The Body and Society*, New York 1988. Examples of works on liturgy where the homily has been used as a source are those of F. van de Paverd, *Zur Geschichte der Messliturgie in Antiocheia und Konstantinopel gegen Ende des vierten Jahrhunderts*, Rome 1970 (OCA 187); R. Kaczynski, *Das Wort Gottes in Liturgie und Alltag der Gemeinden des Johannes Chrysostomus*, Freiburg-Basel-Wien 1974 (Freiburger Theologische Studien 94); and J. Baldovin, op. cit..

[7] See too M. Aubineau, *Les Homélies Festales d'Hésychius de Jérusalem*, Bruxelles 1978, 1980 (Subs. Hag. 59), C. Datema/P. Allen, *Leontii Presbyteri Constantinopolitani Homiliae*, Turnhout-Leuven 1987 (CCSG 17) and P. Allen with C. Datema, *Leontius, Presbyter of Constantinople. Fourteen Homilies*, Brisbane 1991 (Byzantina Australiensia 9).

[8] F. van de Paverd, *St. John Chrysostom, The Homilies on the Statues. An Introduction*, Rome 1991 (OCA 239).

[9] Ordering the information in a way that will not prohibit transferral from one system to another, yet makes it readily available to us for manipulation at the present, has been a priority. With the obsolescence factor in mind, it was decided to avoid the use of specialised data-base software. The simple tools available in any current desk- or lap-top

computer and its word-processing program have been utilised instead. By the use of three special categories which employ key words, information is kept in simple tab-defined columns. Special characters and fonts—Greek key words are transliterated—are also avoided and each entry is restricted to a single line. Once entered, the information can be located and manipulated at any point via the *search* and *sort* commands found in most word-processing software. An explanation of the categories used and an illustration of this methodology are offered in the appendix.

[10] See e.g. Chrysostom, *De sacerdotio* V.1; cf. Bingham, loc. cit., 519-526; Olivar, op. cit., 529-532.

[11] See e.g. *Cod. Theod.* XVI.2.25.

[12] On the delivery of several sermons in succession see F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, I, Oxford 1896, 29.41; 477.30; 531.53; J. Bernardi, *La prédication des Pères Cappadociens. Le prédicateur et son auditoire*, Paris 1968 (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences humaines de l'Université de Montpellier 30) 366; R. Kaczynski, op. cit. (n. 6), 126; Olivar, op. cit., 554-564; 670-721 on the length of homilies.

[13] On this point see R. Taft, "The Frequency of the Eucharist Throughout History", *Concilium* 152 (2/1982) 13-18. Olivar, op. cit., 641-669 has an important discussion of the frequency of preaching.

[14] PG 53,21-54,580. Forty-five of these homilies have received an English translation from R. C. Hill, *St John Chrysostom, Homilies on Genesis 1-17* and *18-45 = The Fathers of the Church* 74 and 82, Washington 1986, 1990.

[15] See C. Mercier/C. Renoux, *Hésychius de Jérusalem. Homélies sur Job. Version arménienne*, 2 vols = PO 42-43, Turnhout 1983.

[16] For the texts see the edition of Datema/Allen (n. 7 above) 185-252; for translations and notes see *Leontius Presbyter of Constantinople. Fourteen Homilies* (n. 7 above) 61-94.

[17] See the information recorded by his biographer Cyprian, *Vita s. Caesarii* I.v (PL 67,1022).

[18] *De ss. martyribus* (CPG 4357) (PG 50,647). This important text is adduced by Bingham, loc. cit., 546-547.

[19] See Bingham, loc. cit., 548, and Olivar, op. cit., 511-514.

[20] This was the substance of a paper by H. F. Stander, "The Clapping of Hands in the Early Church", delivered at the Eleventh International Conference on Patristic Studies, Oxford, 19-24 August 1991.

[21] See Olivar, op. cit., 786-814, 834-867 on audience reactions.

[22] For the text see the edition of Datema/Allen (n. 7 above) 445,319-320; for a translation see *Leontius Presbyter of Constantinople. Fourteen Homilies* (n. 7 above) 191 §26.

[23] *Hom. VI in Philipp.* (PG 62,227-228).

[24] On this point see Olivar, op. cit., 589-640.

[25] *Hist. eccl.* VIII.18.

[26] See further Bingham, loc. cit., 553-558, Olivar, op. cit., 902-904.

[27] See the editor's remarks in PG 63,3-6.

[28] Socrates Scholasticus, *Hist. eccl.* VI.11. On Severian as a preacher see now R. F. Regtuit, *Severian of Gabala. Homily on the Incarnation of Christ (CPG 4204)*. Text, Translation and Introduction, V.U. University Press 1992, 163-213.

[29] On the homilist as a Christian orator see R. L. Wilken, op. cit. (n. 6 above), 101-112.

[30] There is reasonable, but by no means complete agreement among scholars concerning where Chrysostom preached what. Standard works on the question are: H. Lietzmann, art. "Johannes Chrysostomos", *Paulys Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 9 (1916) cols 1811-1828 = *Kleine Schriften* I, Berlin 1958 (TU 67) 326-347; M. von Bonsdorff, *Zur Predigttätigkeit des Johannes Chrysostomus, biographisch-chronologische Studien über seine Homilienserien zu neutestamentlichen Büchern*, diss. Helsingfors 1922; C. Baur, *Johannes Chrysostomus und seine Zeit*, 2 vols., Munich 1929-1930 = *John Chrysostom and His Time*, 2 vols., Westminster, 1959-1960.

[31] *Hom. IV in Col.* (PG 62,330).

[32] *Hom. XIII in Philipp.* (PG 62,275).

[33] *Hom. XV in Philipp.* (PG 62,295).

[34] For the background to these admonitions see O. Pasquato, *Gli Spettacoli in s. Giovanni Crisostomo. Paganesimo e Cristianesimo ad Antiochia e Constantinopoli nel IV secolo*, Rome 1976 (OCA 201). On the general antithesis in homiletic literature between worthy and unworthy preoccupations see M. Harl, "La dénonciation des festivités profanes dans le discours épiscopal et monastique, en orient chrétien, à la fin du IVe siècle", in: *La Fête, pratique et discours. D'Alexandrie hellénistique à la mission de Besançon*, Paris 1981 (Centre de Recherches d'Histoire Ancienne 42), 123-147. See further R. C. Hill, "On giving up the horses for Lent (Chrysostom on Genesis)", *The Clergy Review* 68 (March 1983) 105-106. For a treatment of similar admonitions in the sixth century to the Antiochene faithful and their pertinence to everyday life at the time see F. Graffin, "La vie à Antioche d'après les homélies de Sévère. Invectives contre les courses de chevaux, le théâtre et les jeux olympiques", in: G. Wiessner (ed.), *Erkenntnisse und Meinungen* II, Wiesbaden 1978 (Göttinger Orientforschung Syriaca 17), 115-130.

[35] *Hom. XV in Heb.* (PG 63,121).

[36] For the same theme in six of Chrysostom's Antiochene homilies (PG 58,963-1054) see the translations of the homilies *De Lazaro* by C. P. Roth, *St John Chrysostom On Wealth and Poverty*, Crestwood, N.Y. 1984.

[37] *Hom. I in Col.* (PG 62,306).

[38] Ibid., 304.

[39] Ibid.

[40] *Hom. VII in Col.* (PG 62,349-350).

[41] Ibid., 351-352.

[42] *Hom. X in Philipp.* (PG 62,259).

[43] Ibid.

[44] *Hom. X in Col.* (PG 62,372-373).

[45] *Hom. XX in Heb.* (PG 63,145).

[46] *Hom. XXVIII in Heb.* (PG 63,197).

[47] Ibid.

[48] *Hom. X in Philipp.* (PG 62,259).

[49] *Hom. XI in Heb.* (PG 63,93-94).

[50] Ibid., 94.

[51] *Hom. II in Philipp.* (PG 62,198).

[52] It appears that in the Greek tradition a different phase in the relationship between liturgy, preaching and participation of the laity begins around the seventh to eighth century. See Cunningham, art. cit., 30, 36-42. Baldovin, op. cit., 212f., discusses the effect of this phenomenon at Constantinople.

[53] For a more detailed discussion see A. Verheul, "Le service de la Parole", *QL* 56 (1975) 225-256 and "Le Service de la Parole chez les Juifs et chez les Chrétiens", *QL* 57 (1976) 3-39. On the dismissal of the uninitiated see Cunningham, art. cit., 31.

[54] In the non-Greek tradition, the Gospel lection did not always come first. See Olivar, "Quelques remarques historiques sur la prédication comme action liturgique dans l'église ancienne", in: *Mélanges liturgiques offerts au R. P. Dom Bernard Botte O.S.B.*, Louvain 1972, 430-432.

[55] There are numerous examples in the Greek tradition of reference by the homilist to a preceding lection. See for instance Chrys., *Hom. VIII in Col.* (PG 62,358); Proclus, *Or. in Ram. Palmarum* (PG 65,776); and Leontius, *Hom. on Palm Sunday*, Datema/Allen (n. 7 above) 85, 90. For examples in the non-Greek tradition see Olivar, ibid., 430f.

[56] Van de Paverd, op. cit. (n. 6), provides an excellent example of the wealth of detail which can be elicited. For corrections and addenda to this work see ibid., "Anaphoral intercessions, epiclesis and communion-rites in John Chrysostom", *OCP* 49 (1983) 303-339.

[57] *De s. hieromartyre Phoca* (PG 50,699).

[58] It is clear from what is said later in the homily that the whole population is expected to set out in boats (PG 50,700). For another example of this at Constantinople see Chrys., *Contra ludos et theatra* (PG 65,265).

[59] καὶ γὰρ καὶ βασιλεῖς κοινῇ μεθ' ἡμῶν χορεύουσι (PG 50,699).

[60] This is made clear elsewhere. See Chrys., *Hom. dicta postquam reliquiae martyrum* (PG 63,467-472) and *Hom. dicta praesente imperatore* (PG 63,473-478).

[61] Μηδεὶς ἀπολιμπανέσθω τῆς ἱερᾶς ταύτης πανηγύρεως· μὴ παρθένος οἴκοι μενέτω, μὴ γυνὴ τὴν οἰκίαν κατεχέτω ... (PG 50,699).

[62] Λαμπρὰ γέγονεν ἡμῖν χθὲς ἡ πόλις... Ἀπελείφθης χθές; παραγενοῦ κἂν σήμερον ... (PG 50,699).

[63] Ὁ μὲν γὰρ καὶ χθὲς ἔλεγον, καὶ σήμερον πάλιν λέγω ... (PG 50,700).

[64] Ἀλλὰ τοῦ μὲν μάρτυρος τὰ ἐγκώμια εἰς τὸν προσήκοντα καιρὸν ἀναμείνωμεν (PG 50,700).

[65] βλέπε αὐτὸν καὶ διὰ τοῦ πελάγους πλέοντα, ... (PG 50,699); Ποιήσωμεν πάλιν τὴν θάλατταν ἐκκλησίαν μετὰ λαμπάδων ἐξιόντες ἐκεῖσε, καὶ τὸ πῦρ ἐνυγραίνοντες, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ ἐμπιμπλῶντες πυρός (PG 50,700). For a later example of this practice at Constantinople see Arethas of Caesarea's homily on the consecration of the church of S. Lazarus (BHG 2226) in: R. J. H. Jenkins/B. Laourdas/C. Mango, "Nine orations of Arethas from Cod. Marc. Gr. 524", *ByzZ* 47 (1954) 22-25; in particular p. 23 ll.33-38.

[66] κενώσωμεν τὴν πόλιν, καὶ πρὸς τὸν τάφον τοῦ μάρτυρος μεθορμίσωμεν· (PG 50,699).

[67] On the precise nature of the relationship between urban society and liturgy at Constantinople at this time see Baldovin, op. cit., 259-262.

[68] On the relationship between liturgy and local topography at Constantinople, Jerusalem and Rome see Baldovin, op. cit. On this relationship in the non-Greek tradition see further V. Saxer, "L'utilisation par la liturgie de l'espace urbain et suburbain: l'exemple de Rome dans l'Antiquité et le Haut Moyen Âge", in: *Actes du XIe Congrès International d'Archéologie Chrétienne.* Lyon, Vienne, Grenoble, Genève et Aoste (21-28 septembre 1986), Rome 1989 (Collection de l'École Française de Rome 123; Studi di Antichità Cristiana XLI), 917-1033; and P. Saint-Roch, "L'utilisation liturgique de l'espace urbain et suburbain. L'exemple de quatre villes de Francie", in: ibid., 1103-1115. On variation in liturgical procedure between local churches see for example B. Dufaÿ, "À propos du baptême: l'évêque, la ville et la campagne. Le cas de la Syrie", in: ibid., 637-650; and G. Dagron, "Constantinople. Les sanctuaires et l'organisation de la vie

religieuse", in: ibid., 1069-1085, in particular 1080-1083. For recent discussion on the relationship between local architecture and liturgy see the summary provided by S. de Blaauw, "Architecture and Liturgy in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Traditions and Trends in Modern Scholarship", *ALW* 33 (1991) 1-34.

[69] *Hom. habita postquam presbyter Gothus* (PG 63,499-510).

[70] On the church of S. Thomas see *Hom. dicta postquam reliquiae martyrum* (PG 63,467-472) and *Hom. dicta praesente imperatore* (PG 63,473-478). On the church of S. Eirene see *De studio praesentium* (PG 63,485-492). On the church of Anastasia see *Adversus eos qui non adfuerant* (PG 63,477-486) and *Hom. dicta in templo s. Anastasiae* (PG 63,493-500). On the Great Church (S. Sophia) see *In illud: Pater meus usque modo operatur* (PG 63,511-516). On the church of the Apostles see *Adversus catharos* (PG 63,491-494). On the church of S. Paul (also known as the Church of the Apostle and the Church of the Goths) see *Hom. habita postquam presbyter Gothus* (PG 63,499-510) and *In illud; Messis quidem multa* (PG 63,515-524). On an unidentified suburban martyrium see *Quod frequenter conveniendum sit* (PG 63,461-468). For the relationship between architecture and liturgy at these churches see further T. F. Matthews, *The Byzantine Churches of Istanbul: A Photographic Survey*, University Park-London 1976, and id., *The Early Churches of Constantinople: Architecture and Liturgy*, University Park-London 1977.

[71] Ἀλλὰ τί πάθω; τῶν Μακκαβαίων ὁ χορὸς πρὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἵσταται τῶν ἐμῶν, καὶ τῇ λαμπηδόνι τῶν οἰκείων τραυμάτων καταυγάζων μου τὴν διάνοιαν ... *De Eleazaro et septem pueris* (PG 63,525). The Maccabean brothers are usually associated with Antioch. For the Constantinopolitan provenance of this homily see J. Pargoire, "Les homélies de s. Jean Chrysostome en juillet 399", *EO* 3 (1899-1900) 159-161.

[72] On the importance of the visual in the early liturgy see M. R. Miles, " 'The evidence of our eyes': Patristic studies and popular Christianity in the fourth century", *Studia Patristica* XVIII (1985) 59-63.

Australian Catholic University.
P.O. Box 247 *Everton Park Qld* 4053 Australia

Vigiliae Christianae 47 (1993), 281-312, E. J. Brill, Leiden

REVIEWS

P. Prestel, *Die Rezeption der ciceronischen Rhetorik durch Augustinus in "de doctrina Christiana"* (Studien zur klassischen Philologie, Band 69). Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang, 1992. 307 p.

Augustine's *De doctrina Christiana* is perhaps the most sustained effort of the patristic age to provide a foundation to the *usus iustus* of the accomplishments of Graeco-Roman culture. Such correct usage is an indispensable instrument in the process of understanding the Bible, which the author puts decidedly in the centre of all culture. Wrong usage implies the dangerous habit to 'enjoy' things which should only be 'used', viz. as signs referring to that which should truly be enjoyed. The sharp difference between *frui* and *uti* in hermeneutical practice and theory is the guiding principle of the argument in the first part of *doctr.chr.* As it is put by Dr. Prestel on p. 67 of the book under review, "*uti* bedeutet, die Welt als *signum* zu erkennen und zu transzendieren". This belongs to the domain of *scientia*, which "ist bezogen auf ontologisch zweitrangige Dinge, *res transeuntes*, die sie als *signa* erkennen und transzendieren muss" (76) and which is subordinate to *sapientia* in its *perfrui* of divine truth.

Augustine spent three books on a thorough elucidation of what he calls the *modus inveniendi, quae intellegenda sunt* (1.1, quoted in 4.1). The 4th book deals with the *modus proferendi quae intellecta sunt* (ib.) and is thus "ein 'rhetorisches' Buch, insbesondere darin, dass es von der Situation und Person des öffentlichen Redners ausgeht" (51-52). It was written thirty years later (see *retr.* 2.4), when Augustine had gained a vast experience in the actual practice of preaching. This aspect is not considered by P., who instead focuses fully on the theoretical problems involved in Christian rhetoric. This is justified in that *doctr.chr.* 4 is not an afterthought nor the product of reflections which were developed on the basis of other principles or viewpoints. Time and again P. implicitly or explicitly stresses the unity of the two parts of *doctr.chr.*, both of which primarily concern the task of disclosing the *divinarum litterarum operta* (*prol.* 1). This means that the rhetoric of the Christian preacher is "die notwendige Fortsetzung und Erfüllung des eigenen geglückten Textverstehens" (288).

Nevertheless, *doctr.chr.* 4 is Augustine's *De oratore* and not surprisingly he refers a few times to the greatest authority among the *Romanae principes eloquentiae* (4.4), without, however, mentioning his name. P. uses these allusions and quotations to bring out the precise characteristics of Augustine's rhetoric, in which *sapienter dicere* has absolute priority. Whereas Cicero sought the synthesis of philosophy and *eloquentia*, Augustine gave the prime place to the "christliche *sapientia*, in die er die paganen *scientiae* integrieren will" (151). An excellent illustration is provided by Augustine's approval (*verum dixit*) of Cicero's well-known short definition of the three *officia* in *Or.* 69 (*doctr.chr.* 4.27). It soon becomes clear that for Augustine *docere* is not an instrument of persuasion, but the explanation of biblical truth. Thus Cicero's phrase *docere necessitatis est* is in fact given a wholly new meaning: "*necessitatis* meint nicht nur wie bei Cicero die mindeste Voraussetzung, sondern — im günstigen Fall — auch schon die einzige" (235). The other two *officia* essentially play second fiddle to *docere*: "*delectare* und *flectere* sind Fortsetzungen des *docere* mit anderen Mitteln, je nach Zustand des Adressaten nötig oder auch weglassbar" (230). Now anyone studying the second half of *doctr.chr.* 4 will come across the large part allotted to *movere*: people have to be incited to proceed to actions which they have understood and acknowledged as their Christian duties. It is, however, evident that Augustine is somewhat at a loss what to think of *delectare*, the providing of aesthetic pleasure. From the stylistic point of view, in which the three *officia* are combined with the three *genera*, this can be phrased as follows: "während der niedere wie der hohe Stil Sachbezug mit Wirkungsbezug verbinden..., fehlt beim mittleren Stil genau der Bezug zur Sache" (251). It tends to draw the attention to the orator's artistic skill, which would endanger Augustine's exclusive focus on the *res* (in the sense mentioned above). But this traditional "Selbstverweis auf den Redner" is transformed to a "Hilfsfunktion des *flectere*" (289). In an interesting note (294 n. 20) P. asks the pertinent question whether Augustine's minimalizing the importance of the orator is not a flaw in his "Kommunikationsmodell".

P.'s own concentration on contents has, I am afraid, also resulted in a depreciation of *delectare*. Although his argument should not be styled prolix—that would imply quite undeserved connotations—, it certainly is circumstantial. The fear to leave something unsaid, or less satisfactorily said, has prevailed upon the dangers of repetitiveness. Besides, P. does not always succeed in devising the clearest expression of his

paraphrases and analyses. All this makes studying his book a daunting task, which, however, should be no means be eschewed. *De doctrina Christiana*, book 4 in particular, has, of course, been the object of much valuable research—H. I. Marrou's famous *Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique* comes readily to mind—, but to the best of my knowledge this is the first really thorough and detailed analysis of its fundamental theses. In this analysis P. indeed pays ample attention to Augustine's "Rezeption" of Cicero's rhetoric, yet the title of his study perhaps lays too much stress on this admittedly important aspect. It is in fact Augustine's fully autonomous handling of the whole domain which it is all about. G. Kennedy considered this to be an example of Augustine's habit "to secularize human institutions" (*Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Traditions from Ancient to Modern Times*. London, 1980, 159). From his point of view P. arrives at a cognate formula in concluding that Augustine was "ein Meister der Funktionalisierung" (296). He has fully illustrated this in his commendable book.

2353 BM *Leiderdorp*, van Effendreef 15 J. DEN BOEFT

J. McWilliam (ed.), *Augustine: From Rhetor to Theologian*. Waterloo (Ontario), Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1992. X, 237 p.

This collection contains a selection of papers read at a conference held at Toronto in May 1987. Apart from one historical study (T.D. Barnes on the relations between Ambrose and Symmachus) these papers concern the *Confessiones*, i.e. primarily its literary aspects—perhaps the first noun in the title of the book under review refers to these—, and several theological themes.

K.B. Steinhauser deals with the unity of the *Confessiones*, laying special emphasis on Augustine's quest for beauty. The various literary techniques are discussed by J.J. O'Meara, while L. Ferrari argues that "reference analysis" discloses that Rom 13.13-14 is never quoted before *Conf.* 8.29, which proves the fictional character of the conversion scene. C. Starnes explains the meaning of the short biography of Monica in *Conf.* 9, J. Scott stresses the importance of the biblical and martyrological traditions in providing inspiring examples. R.J. Teske's paper on the *homo spiritualis* is the link with the theological contribu-

tions. J. Wetzel shows that the theory of grace, which Augustine developed in the anti-Pelagian tracts, was anticipated in *Ad Simplicianum*. W.S. Babcock criticizes Augustine for his failure to clarify the moral responsibility of the agents in the primal sin, while C.P. Slater argues that the specific character of goodness as order and harmony curtails the freedom of man's creative cooperation. J. Patout Burns' analysis of *De baptismo* brings out the changes of view within that treatise. R.D. Crouse treats the further developments of Augustine's Platonism as these can be witnessed in Boethius and Eriugena.

The scholarly qualities of these short, but dense papers, in which all superficiality is eschewed, are praiseworthy. Experts will no doubt benefit by these reflections. Readers with a more general interest in Augustine are served by surveys of 20th century research in two fields, ecclesiology (M.A. Fahey) and Christology (J. McWilliam). The collection is completed by T. Halton's useful catalogue of modern translations. Here, however, the long time elapsed between the 1987 conference and the publication of the papers takes some toll: 1986 is the last year covered. This entails e.g. the absence of BA 46B (the Divjak letters) and 73a and b (*Homélies sur l'Évangile de Saint Jean* XXXIV-XLIII and XLIV-LIV respectively) and the curious announcement that G. Lombardo's rendering of *On Faith and Works* is forthcoming. It was published in 1988, see this journal 44,400-401.

2353 BM *Leiderdorp* J. DEN BOEFT

S. Pricoco, *Monaci, filosofi e santi.* Saggi di storia della cultura tardoantica (Armarium. Biblioteca di storia e cultura religiosa. Vol. 1). Messina, Rubbettino Editore, 1992. 393 p.

The first part of this collection of papers is concerned with the rise and the characteristics of the monastic movement, specifically in southern Gaul. Much attention is paid to Lérins, at present called Saint-Honorat, "l'isola dei santi", to quote the title of the author's fine monograph (Rome, 1978; see this journal 34, 203-205). Its typically aristocratic atmosphere, which left little room for "taumaturgia" and radical forms of asceticism, contributed to its developing as a seminary for bishops. P. denies such a role to Cassiodorus' *Vivarium*, the importance of which as a centre of culture has been much exaggerated in his

view. The part allotted to southern Italy and Sicily also contains a long survey of medieval Sicilian hagiography. In the final four papers P. deals with the image and the place of intellectuals and philosophers in late antique society. Among these papers a critical assessment of G. Bowersock's concise biography of Julian (London, 1978) stands out as an illustrative specimen of the thoughtful erudition which characterizes P.'s scholarly work. The 14 papers, which were published between 1974 and 1989, have not been copied in their original form, they were truly reprinted. Thus outward form adds to the inner coherence of these studies.

Contents: I. Aspetti culturali del primo monachesimo d'Occidente (9-37); II. Ausonio: un testimone polemico del monachesimo (39-55); III. Modelli di santità a Lerino. L'ideale ascetico nel *Sermo de vita Honorati* di Ilario d'Arles (57-83); IV. Eucherio di Lione: un padre della chiesa tra Erasmo e Tillemont (85-115); V. Romanità e teologia politica nel *de contemptu mundi* di Eucherio di Lione (117-130); VI. Un Lerinese illustre: Salviano di Marsiglia (131-146); VII. Storia ecclesiastica e storia monastica nel *de viris illustribus* di Gennadio (147-178); VIII. Il Vivario di Cassiodoro (179-206); IX. La Scala di Giacobbe (207-237); X. Monaci e santi di Sicilia (239-295); XI. Filosofi e professori di filosofia. Vecchi e nuovi modelli culturali tra IV e V secolo (297-317); XII. L'editto di Valentiniano sui filosofi (319-341); XIII. Giuliano l'apostata (343-352); XIV. I sofisti nel giudizio dei cristiani (353-372); Indici (373-393).

2353 BM *Leiderdorp*, van Effendreef 15 J. DEN BOEFT

Athénagore, *Supplique au sujet des chrétiens et Sur la résurrection des morts*. Introduction, texte et traduction par Bernard Pouderon (Sources Chrétiennes 379). Les Editions du Cerf, Paris 1992. 368 pp. 276 F.

En 1989 parut un ouvrage de synthèse de la main de Bernard Pouderon sur l'apologiste chrétien Athénagore: *Athénagore d'Athènes, philosophe chrétien* (voir cette revue 46, 1992, 190-191). Maintenant le même auteur a publié le texte et la traduction des deux ouvrages qui nous sont parvenus sous le nom de cet écrivain chrétien, contemporain de l'empereur Marc-Aurèle. Le texte est accompagné d'une Introduction bien ordonnée (9-59) et de notes qui servent à recréer l'«environnement idéologique, historique et polémique» du texte et qui fournissent en premier lieu un grand nombre de *loca parallela*. Les Index sont très détaillés, tant la liste des noms propres (avec des données complémentaires et le

contexte dans lequel ils sont mentionnés) que celle des citations (à part la distinction entre les citations propres et les allusions nous y trouvons une brève indication du contenu). Dans quelques Appendices (319-343) M. Pouderon traite des questions qu'il était impossible de faire rentrer dans les notes.

Depuis longtemps le texte de la *Supplique* a été étudié minutieusement. La primauté du manuscrit *P 451* (le fameux *Codex d'Aréthas*) pour la constitution du texte ne fait pas de doute, mais néanmoins au cours du temps les éditeurs nombreux ont proposé mainte conjecture. Tout en les rejetant en bonne partie pour retenir autant que possible les leçons des manuscrits, M. Pouderon — dans quelques cas — offre lui-même quelques amendements nouveaux, résultat d'un jugement équilibré; notamment ἧττον au lieu du *textus receptus* ἢ τῶν (202, *Supplique* 35,4) nous semble être une émendation très heureuse.

A propos de l'usage chrétien du baiser de paix, Athénagore cite un *agraphon* (196, *Supplique* 32,4): οὕτως οὖν ἀκριβώσασθαι τὸ φίλημα μᾶλλον δὲ τὸ προσκύνημα δεῖ. M. Pouderon traduit ce texte, qui est précédé d'un autre *agraphon* incomplet, en ces termes: «Il faut donc régler strictement le baiser, plus encore que la salutation.» Mais μᾶλλον δὲ exprimant en général une correction, je voudrais proposer pour ce texte un peu cryptique la traduction suivante: «Il faut donc régler strictement le baiser, ou plutôt la salutation (ou bien: le témoignage de respect).»

L'auteur déclare avoir privilégié «la fidélité au sens» (57), principe qui a garanti une traduction claire et lisible. Peut-être que dans *Supplique* 34,3 (200-201), où le traducteur à bon droit a coupé en plusieurs morceaux une longue phrase embarrassée, on aurait préféré une traduction plus littérale: maintenant on y cherche en vain la traduction de ἐξετάσαντες. Ce texte (καὶ τοῦτό ἐστι σαρκῶν ἅπτεσθαι ἀνθρωπικῶν, τὸ κειμένων νόμων, οὓς ὑμεῖς καὶ οἱ ὑμέτεροι πρόγονοι παρὰ πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην ἐξετάσαντες ἐθήκατε, παρὰ τούτους αὐτοὺς βίαζεσθαι), M. Pouderon le traduit ainsi: «Ce qu'on appelle se nourrir de chair humaine, c'est aller contre les lois existantes que vous et vos aïeux avez établies pour parvenir à la plus grande justice.» Une traduction plus littérale semble possible ici; je voudrais proposer: «Et c'est là toucher à de la chair humaine si, alors qu'il existe des lois que vous et vos aïeux, en vue d'une justice entière, avez scrupuleusement établies, vous leur (c'est-à-dire les faibles mentionnés un peu plus haut) faites violence en contradiction avec ces mêmes lois.»

Le lecteur trouvera dans cette édition tout ce qu'il lui faut: outre une

traduction agréable à lire une introduction instructive et des notes qui partout reflètent les recherches (on verra p. ex. à la page 186[3] la remarque sur le livre III des *Oracula Sibyllina*).

6523 LH *Nijmegen*, Postweg 152 G.J.M. BARTELINK

Dom Pierre Miquel, *Le vocabulaire de l'expérience spirituelle dans la tradition patristique grecque du IVe au XIVe siècle* (Théologie historique 86). Paris, Beauchesne, 1992, 206 p. 195 FF.

Dom Pierre Miquel est spécialiste du monachisme, non seulement sous l'aspect des idées du monde monacal, mais aussi sous celui de son vocabulaire (on se référera à ses études *Lexique du désert* [1986] et *Le vocabulaire latin de l'expérience spirituelle dans la tradition monastique et canoniale de 1050 à 1250* [1989]). De plus son livre *L'expérience de Dieu* (1977[2]) aura préparé la voie à ses recherches récentes sur le vocabulaire de l'expérience spirituelle dans la tradition patristique grecque. Sans prétendre donner une vue exhaustive et en ne présentant qu'un échantillonnage, l'auteur présente néanmoins une collection utile de sources prises dans les oeuvres des Pères et des moines grecs. Ces matériaux sont accompagnés de commentaires et de conclusions assez sommaires.

L'auteur semble établir un rapprochement étymologique entre ἄπειρος au sens d'«infini» et au sens d'«inexpérimenté». De façon pareille il aborde le terme ἀπειρία qui a, lui aussi, un double sens. Mais bien que ἀπειρία désigne tant la connaissance insuffisante de ce qu'on pratique que l'illimité, l'infini, il ne serait pas correct de définir ce dernier sens par «ce dont on ne peut avoir expérience» (p. 16): il s'agit plutôt d'homonymes. On ne saurait donc dire de l'infini (*apeiron*) que «c'est ce dont on ne peut faire l'expérience» (p. 30). Ἄπειρος au sens d'«inexpériencé» est un dérivé de πεῖρα («expérience»), tandis que son homonyme au sens d'«illimité», «infini» remonte à πεῖραρ/πέρας («limite», «fin»). Dans l'usage commun ils se présentent comme deux termes distincts.

Il est évident que le thème de l'expérience spirituelle n'a pas eu pour tous les auteurs chrétiens la même importance et qu'ils ont usé du vocabulaire en question d'une manière fort diverse. On s'étonne cependant de ne trouver, parmi un si grand nombre de textes, que trois passages

empruntés aux oeuvres de Grégoire de Nazianze (p. 42), dont en outre aucun ne se rapporte à l'expérience spirituelle de l'homme. Le premier (πεῖρα μήτηρ συνέσεως) reproduit une pensée qu'on trouve déjà chez le poète Alcman: πεῖρα τοι μαθήσιος ἀρχή (Fragm. 109 Diehl). Ce petit nombre est en contraste avec les données sur Grégoire de Nysse (p. 49): si πεῖρα manque chez lui, αἴσθησις se trouve près de 40 fois dans ses oeuvres.

Dans le dossier qui comprend un grand nombre d'auteurs se sont glissées quelques inexactitudes. Quand Dom Miquel dit (p. 29) que «Clément de Rome invite ses correspondants à combattre le bon combat», il faut bien se rendre compte que la soi-disant *II Ep. Clem.*, l'écrit dans lequel cette citation a été prise, n'est ni une lettre ni de la main de Clément. A propos de l'affirmation (p. 19) qu'un passage des *Ennéades* de Plotin (IV 8,7,15) a pu influencer un passage d'Irénée (*Adv. haer.* IV 39), notons que, malgré une certaine analogie entre les deux textes, l'idée que Plotin aurait exercé une influence quelconque sur Irénée est impossible, les *Ennéades* ayant été écrites plus d'un demi-siècle après l'*Adversus haereses*. A la page 35, enfin, un passage de l'*Exhortation au martyre* d'Origène s'est égaré parmi les textes de Clément d'Alexandrie.

Sans se vouloir une étude linguistique systématique, le livre de Dom Pierre Miquel nous présente un aperçu bien utile de ce que les auteurs chrétiens et les moines grecs ont énoncé sur plusieurs aspects de l'expérience spirituelle.

6523 LH *Nijmegen*, Postweg 152 G.J.M. BARTELINK

Augustinus, *De utilitate credendi/Über den Nutzen des Glaubens.* Übersetzt und eingeleitet von Andreas Hoffmann (Fontes Christiani 9). Herder, Freiburg usw., 1992. 220 S. DM 36,—.

Andreas Hoffmann, *Augustins Schrift 'De utilitate credendi': Einleitung, Übersetzung, Analyse*, Diss. masch. Münster 1991. X-613 S. [Anschrift Autor: Tulpenstiege 1, D-4710 Lüdinghausen].

Bis vor kurzem wurde Augustins Schrift *De utilitate credendi* von der Forschung kaum beachtet. Wichtige Studien wurden publiziert von O. Gigon ('Augustins De utilitate credendi', in: *Catalepton. Festschrift für B. Wyss*, Basel 1985, 138-157), von Chr. Schäublin ('Augustin, »De utilitate credendi«, Über das Verhältnis des Interpreten zum Text', *Vig.*

Chr. 43, 1989, 53-68) und von W. Hensellek ('Beobachtungen zur Sprache von Augustins De utilitate credendi', in: *AÖAW.PH* 115, 1978, 16-41). Der letztgenannte Autor erstellte zusammen mit P. Schilling auch einen sehr nützlichen *Werksindex* (*Beihefte zum CSEL* 3, Wien 1977). Aber eine eigenständige Monographie zu der zwischen Anfang 391 und August 392 entstandenen Schrift Augustins, dem Erstling nach seiner Priesterweihe, fehlte. Diese Lücke wird jetzt auf schöne und überzeugende Weise ausgefüllt durch das obengenannte Buch von Andreas Hoffmann in der Reihe *Fontes Christiani.*

Was der Autor hier einem breiteren Publikum darbietet, hatte er zuvor ausführlich und gründlich ausgearbeitet in einer von dem bekannten Augustinus-Forscher Erich Feldmann betreuten Münsterischen Dissertation. Obwohl diese Dissertation (vorläufig?) eine unentbehrliche Fundgrube bleiben wird für jeden, der die wissenschaftliche Forschung zu Augustins *util. cred.* weiterführen will, können wir uns hier hauptsächlich beschränken auf das spät im Jahr 1992 erschienene Buch.

In seiner 'Einleitung' (7-75) zeichnet Hoffmann deutlich und zuverlässig den Autor, die Stellung von *util. cred.* im Gesamtwerk Augustins, den Adressaten Honoratus (dem freilich hier so wenig wie in der Dissertation schlüssig nachgewiesen wird, daß er ein manischäischer *auditor* blieb; vgl. Decrets Vermutung über einen — m.E. nicht wahrscheinlichen und, gegebenenfalls, erst späteren — Status als *electus*), die Intention des Werkes, die Gliederung, die Kritik der nordafrikanischen Manichäer an der *catholica* und Augustins Antwort auf die manichäische Bibel- und Glaubenskritik. Den Beschluß bilden eine überzeugende Widerlegung der (z.B. schon von Schäublin bezweifelten) These Gigons, daß *util. cred.* in der vorliegenden Form eine zweifache Überarbeitung einer Grundschrift sei (72-74; eingehender Diss. 567-589), und einige kurze Bemerkungen zur Methode und zum Text.

Dieser der *CSEL*-Ausgabe von J. Zycha entnommene und davon nur in einigen dringenden Ausnahmefällen abweichende Text bildet, zusammen mit einer Übersetzung und neunzig erläuternden Anmerkungen, den Kern von Hoffmanns Buch (78-193). Nun könnte man sich die 'zielsprachenorientierte' Übersetzung natürlich stellenweise anders wünschen (z.B.: in *ut. cred.* 2: *...annos fere novem...* blieb das wichtige Wort *fere* unübersetzt; *util. cred.* 3: *...tenebrosam spem gerens de pulchritudine uxoris...*: besser 'die finstere Hoffnung auf die weibliche Schönheit' statt der allzu konkreten und deshalb in diesem Kontext weniger passenden Übersetzung 'die finstere Hoffnung auf *eine schöne*

Frau'; *util. cred.* 36 Schlußsatz: *in ceteris* bezieht sich nicht auf 'die übrigen *Fragen*', sondern auf die dem Honoratus hier versprochenen künftigen Schriften Augustins [Bezugswort ist *volumen*; vgl. außerdem *retract.* I, 14]); dennoch zögere ich nicht, die von Hoffmann geleistete Übertragungsarbeit als eine glänzende Leistung zu begrüßen. Schon ein kurzer Vergleich mit C.J. Perls 1966 erschienener Übersetzung macht klar, wie wichtig nicht nur eine gründliche Kenntnis des Lateinischen ist, sondern daß darüberhinaus eine gründliche Vertrautheit mit Augustins Biographie, mit seiner Theologie und nicht zuletzt mit seiner manichäischen Vergangenheit unentbehrlich sind. Hier dürfte Hoffmanns Doktorvater methodisch vorbildlich gewirkt haben.

Was wir den beiden Arbeiten Hoffmanns insbesondere verdanken, ist ein auf verläßliche Weise gewonnener vertiefter Einblick in Augustins nur zögernd sich entwickelndes theologisches Denken. Der Mann, der nur fünf Jahre zuvor als Manichäer Afrika verlassen hatte, diskutiert hier als frischgeweihter Presbyter der *catholica* mit einem Freund, den er selber zu den Manichäern gebracht hatte. Zwei methodische Grundfragen augustinischen Denkens zeichnen sich in diesem Frühwerk ab: die Frage nach der angemessenen Methode biblischer, vor allem alttestamentlicher Exegese — eine der eindrucksvollsten Leistungen Augustins ist m.E. seine Wertschätzung des sog. Alten Testaments als das auch für die Kirche immergültige Gotteswort —, und die Frage nach der Art und Weise der Wahrheitsaneignung. Zum anderen macht diese Schrift in Hoffmanns Bearbeitung deutlich, wie die beiden soeben angesprochenen Grundprobleme mit Augustins Lebensweg verbunden sind: sie erwachsen aus seiner Auseinandersetzung mit der Kritik der nordafrikanischen Manichäer an der *catholica* und spielen zugleich eine wichtige Rolle in seiner Auseinandersetzung mit der eigenen Vergangenheit.

Zu Augustins 'Vergangenheitsbewältigung' möchte ich noch anmerken, daß ein wichtiger und für viele neuer Aspekt vielleicht etwas klarer herausgearbeitet werden könnte. Es ist m.E. bezeichnend und bedeutsam, daß Augustin in *util. cred.* seinem ehemaligen manichäischen Kommilitonen nie den Anspruch streitig macht, er sei ein Christ. Als Christen würdigt er die manichäischen Gegner auch in seinem anderen antimanichäischen Schriften, etwa: in *c. ep. fund.*, *c. Faust.*, *c. Fel.* und in den auch diesbezüglich sehr wichtigen *conf.* In *util. cred.* aber sehen wir nicht nur, daß Augustin zwischen katholischen und häretischen [= manichäischen] *Christen* unterscheidet (z.B. *util. cred.* 4. 19. 30ff. 36) und er mit Honoratus und dessen Freunden über den richtigen *Christus-*

glauben diskutiert (z.B. 31: *Quid, quod omnes haeretici Christo nos credere hortantur?* [...] *Quod illis cum deridendum et plenum temeritatis videtur, profecto, ut Christo credamus, agunt inpudenter.* [...] *Tune mihi melius expositurus es, quid ille* [= Christus] *dixerit, quem fuisse aut esse non putarem, si abs te mihi hoc commendaretur esse credendum?* usw.), sondern hier teilt er uns noch mit, daß er für die Entwicklung seines Gottesverständnisses *Wahres* bei den Manichäern gelernt habe (*util. cred.* 36, z.B.: *Quid ergo didici?* [...] *Ita quod apud eos verum didiceram, teneo, quod falsum putaveram, respuo*). Selbstverständlich dürfen die letzten vier Worte des Zitats in diesem Kontext nicht überhört werden; nicht nur hier, sondern öfter noch in *util. cred.* spricht Augustin sein negatives Urteil, ja seinen Abscheu gegenüber der manichäischen Lehre deutlich aus. Augustin stuft aber die Manichäer als *Christen* ein (vgl. auch seine Religionseinteilung *util. cred.* 19: Christen — Katholiken und Häretiker —, Juden, heidnische Götterkulte); und es ist diese augustinische Einschätzung des ihm gründlich bekannten westlichen Manichäismus als einer Erscheinungsform *des Christentums*, die heute von den in neuerer und neuester Zeit entdeckten manichäischen Texten (z.B. vom *Kölner Mani-Kodex* und von den noch unpublizierten Funden der Dakhleh-Oase) glänzend bestätigt wird. Und höchst bemerkenswert ist darüber hinaus, daß Augustin ganz offen seine Dankesschuld diesem Manichäismus gegenüber anerkennt. Mit alledem hätten wir neuen Anlaß, den Manichäismus als eine wichtige, jedoch nicht nur antithetische, sondern sogar als eine für die Entwicklung von Augustins Theologie *konstruktive* Quelle zu würdigen.

Auch die Herausgeber, namentlich W. Geerlings, sind zu dem schönen neuen Band ihrer stetig fortschreitenden Reihe *Fontes Christiani* zu beglückwünschen.

NL-3703 AH *Zeist*, Van Renesselaan 24 J. VAN OORT

Manichaica Selecta. Studies presented to Professor Julien Ries on the occasion of his seventieth birthday. Edited by Alois van Tongerloo and Søren Giversen (Manichaean Studies, I). Leuven, Departement Orientalistiek (Blijde-Inkomststraat 21), 1991. 402 pp., BF 2450.

This book was offered as a *Festschrift* to Professor Julien Ries of Louvain-la-Neuve, a scholar who devoted a considerable part of his life

to the study of Manichaeism. It consists of 38 contributions which concentrate, almost without exception, on Mani and his gnostic world religion. By studying this book one gains a first-rate impression of the present state of research in this field.

Although in fact all Manichaean studies deserve the attention of patristic scholars—firstly because origin and further development of Manichaeism have close connections with (Jewish-) Christianity; and, secondly, in view of the fact that this *secta* or αἵρεσις provoked the antagonism of the official Catholic Christian Church during many centuries—, here we can only give an overview of some of the essays. L. Cirillo discusses the Turfan fragment *M* 97, which was first published by F. W. K. Müller in 1905 and proved Manichaean acquaintance with the *Pastor Hermae* (49-52). As a supplementary observation to this contribution (and to its n. 10 is particular), we might remark that Western Manichaeans also seem to have been acquainted with the *Pastor Hermae*; see e.g. the Manichaean Secundinus's *Ep. ad Augustinum* 2. F. Decret analyses Augustine's *Contra Faustum* XXI and XX (in this sequence: the author makes a reasonable case for Augustine's inverting the original order), especially elaborating upon the dogma of the Two Principles (59-69). I. Gardner demonstrates that *in their piety* the Manichaeans understood a fundamental oneness and wholeness about the figure of Jesus; they did not merely utilize christological images for their description of the passions of the Living Soul, but considered the entire history of defilement and redemption to be exactly that of Jesus (71-86). J. Helderman gives a study on docetism and incarnation in Manichaeism, with several pertinent remarks on the concept of ἀνάπαυσις as well (101-123). M. Hutter shows how Mani's message in the Empire of the Sassanids presented itself as a *Christian* one (125-135). Of special importance to various scholars is H.-J. Klimkeit's contribution on the diffusion of apocryphal Gospels in Central and East Asia; the author stresses the important part the Manichaeans played as intermediaries and also indicates that through Manichaean intermediation Christian apocryphal Gospels will have had their effect on Buddhism (149-175). L. Leloir investigates why the *Acts of Andrew* could be important to the Manichaeans (191-201). J. M. and S. N. C. Lieu provide an analysis of *Cologne Mani-Codex* 137-140, *inter alia* making several important remarks on different religious groups ('Magusaeans', 'Chaldaeans' and 'Judaeans') in third-century Mesopotamia (203-223).

Their conclusion, however, seems to be too ambiguous: I see no serious objection to the assumption that the community involved in the passage under discussion was a *Jewish* one; and it even seems possible to think of a group of *Jewish-Christians*: for instance the 'Ebionites' as described by Epiphanius (*Pan.* 30,18,2) or the 'Nazoraeans' of whom we know (*Keph.* 221-223 Böhlig) that Mani debated with one of them (cf. Lieu & Lieu, 223). R. Merkelbach offers a number of corrigenda relating to the text of Augustine's works (223-241). As regards the crux interpretum "*Non* lavabis manus post coitum coniugis" (Secundinus, *Ep. ad Aug.* 3) I would suggest the reading "*Nam* lavabis...", a wording both matching Secundinus's enumeration of disapproved acts and, at the same time, giving expression to the Manichaean aversion from marital intercourse. P. A. Mirecki analyses the Coptic Manichaean Psalm 278 and compares an essential part of this Psalm—sc. the putting off of the garment of this flesh and the subsequent trampling upon it—with Logion 37 of the *Gospel of Thomas* (243-262). With respect to the concept "City" in the Manichaean Psalter, it may be remarked that *Psalm-Book* 226,1 Allberry does not refer to "the 'godless' city in which Mani was martyred" nor does 214,15 refer to "the City of Light" (246 n. 7), but that in both cases a *civitas daemonum* or *civitas diaboli* is meant. G. Quispel deals with the Fourth Gospel in the context of the Judaic Gospel tradition (289-293). J. C. Reeves concentrates on Manichaean cosmogony by comparing Theodor bar Konai's well-known account of the 'seduction of the archons' with 1 Enoch 60, 7-10 (295-298). A. Viciano discusses Pauline Christology in Augustine's anti-Manichaean works, a learned but somewhat incongruous contribution because it does not show any specific knowledge of the Manichaean sources (379-389).

For the readers of this periodical these are the studies which will be of particular interest. However, from many other contributions, written by such specialists in Manichaean studies as *inter alia* Bianchi, Böhlig, Giversen, Kasser, Krause, Pedersen, Richter, Rudolph, Sundermann, Van Lindt, Van Tongerloo and Wurst, they can gain much valuable information as well.

NL-3703 AH *Zeist*, Van Renesselaan 24 J. VAN OORT

Studia Manichaica. II. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus (6.-10. August 1989, St. Augustin/Bonn), herausgegeben von Gernot Wießner und Hans-Joachim Klimkeit (Studies in Oriental Religions, Vol. 23). Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1992. XIV + 400 S., DM 90,—.

Thanks to several important discoveries, the study of Manichaeism flourishes as never before. In 1970 A. Henrichs and L. Koenen published their preliminary report on the *Cologne Mani Codex (= CMC)*, the document which established irrefutably that Mani grew up in a Judaeo-Christian milieu. Since then, several new editions of Manichaica have been prepared and made public, the first conferences on Manichaeism have been held, in 1989 an International Association of Manichaean Studies was founded and, last but not least, many important books and articles have been published. Among these publications, the now issued volume with the papers of the Second International Conference on Manichaeism may be seen as a milestone. This volume is not only one of the most comprehensive recent books on Mani's world religion, but it can also be considered as one of the best. By means of 28 contributions, which are provided with extensive indices in two columns ('Autorenregister', 381-385; 'Stellenregister', 387-400), the reader is introduced to many important aspects of the Manichaean studies, the current state of some recent projects and, moreover, to some highly-controversial issues still in debate.

In this necessarily brief review, we can only touch upon some of the most notable contributions. Kurt Rudolph opens with an overview of 'Stand und Aufgaben der Manichäismusforschung' (1-18). Although in some of his recent studies Rudolph gives the impression to return to certain standpoints of the so-called *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* and, in this respect, shows a tendency to play down the great significance of the *CMC* as a witness to the Judaeo-Christian origins of Mani (here e.g. 6: 'Welche Bedeutung der *CMC* für die Anfänge Manis und seiner Kirchenbildung hat, brauche ich hier nicht näher auszuführen'), this richly-documented article is without doubt a masterly and reliable introduction to Manichaeology's present situation and new tasks. Surely not less impressive is the second and by far the largest contribution: James Robinson's fascinating study 'The Fate of the Manichaean Codices of Medinet Madi 1929-1989' (19-62). In this compelling account, which sometimes reaches the heights of a scientific thriller, Robinson not only

unveils several mysteries concerning the (mis)fortune of the seven Manichaean Codices from Medinet Madi in the Egyptian desert of the Fayyum since their acquisition in the early thirties, but he also gives a detailed and in several cases unique survey of their present condition (if any, for some of them seem to be lost once and for all) and, furthermore, outlines a salvage operation which is needed urgently indeed. It is to be hoped that this in several respects pioneering and seminal report will have the desired results. With regard to the unpublished *Kephalaia*-fragments now in Vienna, reference could have been made to an often overlooked communication by I. Gardner in his 'youthful work' *Coptic Theological Papyri II: Edition, Commentary and Translation* (= Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, N.S. XXI. Folge, Textband), Wien 1988, 53-55.

Of the other 26 contributions, we can only mention here: A. Böhlig's pertinent remarks on some new texts and other data provided by Giversen's facsimile-edition of the Manichaica now preserved in Dublin (63-75), M. Krause's introduction to the work of three researchers from Munich on three groups of Manichaean Psalms (80-92; for the readers of this journal we quote the characteristic sentence: 'Zumindest für die von uns untersuchten Teile des Psalmenbuches [sc. the Psalms of the Bema, the Psalms of Heracleides and the Ψαλμοὶ Σαρακώτων] ist kennzeichnend, daß das christliche Gedankengut, oft Gleichnisse des Neuen Testaments, primär den Ausgangspunkt von Psalmen bildet und nicht erst sekundär hinzugekommen ist.' [88-89]), G. Casadio's painstaking study of the Manichaean Metempsychosis (105-130; it may be noted that as a parallel to the Manichaean dogma of the predetermined number of souls [109] reference can be made not only to the Pythagorean-Platonic doctrine as stated in the *Timaeus* [41 d; cf. *Republic* X, 611 a], but also to e.g. Jewish and Judaeo-Christian doctrines), H.-J. Klimkeit's detailed exposition of the Manichaean doctrine of the Old and New Man as primarily inspired by the apostle Paul (131-150), J. Ries's paper on the *CMC* and the beginnings of Mani's teachings (167-180; his reference to *2 Clement* 3,1 and 20,5 as the only parallels to Mani's designation of God as πατήρ τῆς ἀληθείας [*CMC* 66, 6-7, a quotation from Mani's *Gospel*] can be supplemented by several others from early Christian sources [e.g. from Athanasius, Basil of Caesarea, Epiphanius, Gregory of Nyssa, Irenaeus, Origen] and even by an early pagan one [Plutarch, *Mor.* 266 E: Διὰ τί δὲ τὸν Κρόνον πατέρα τῆς ἀληθείας νομίζουσι;), L. Cirillo's fine and seminal study '«Hermae Pastor» and «Revelatio

Manichaica». Some Remarks' (189-197; as a supplement to p. 191 it may be remarked that already before 1986 it was suspected and fuller documented that signs of Manichaean familiarity with Hermas can be detected in the Manichaean Secundinus's *Ep. ad Augustinum*; see now the present reviewer's *Jerusalem and Babylon*, Leiden etc. 1991, 303 n. 606), A. Viciano's well-documented and thorough study 'Theodoret von Kyros und der Manichäismus in seinem Kommentar zu den Paulusbriefen' (198-212), Peter Nagel's article of the same high quality 'Der Dialog im manichäischen Psalter' (220-238; partly following Richter the author gives an analysis of e.g. *Psalm-Book* 187, the wondrously beautiful — and world's oldest? — 'Passionspiel' inspired by John 20,11-18) and, finally, the four pioneering and profound studies by S. Richter ('Untersuchungen zu Form und Inhalt einer Gruppe der Herakleides-Psalmen [*PsB* 187,1-36]', 248-265), G. Wurst ('Strukturale Textanalyse und Gattungskritik manichäischer Psalmen am Beispiel des Bemapsalmes Nr. 239', 266-284), M. Hutter ('Sprachliche und terminologische Beobachtungen zu M 98/99 und M 7980-84', 285-304) and W. Sundermann ('Iranische Kephalaiatexte?', 305-318). In particular, from Richter's and Wurst's analyses we can again discern that the Manichaean Church, especially in her piety, displayed herself as a Christian Church, being deeply inspired by biblical (predominantly NT-) texts and themes.

Our thanks are due to authors and editors for their fine book.

NL-3703 AH *Zeist*, Van Renesselaan 24 J. VAN OORT

"De Genesi contra Manichaeos" "De Genesi ad litteram liber imperfectus" di Agostino d'Ippona, commenti di G. Palland, G. Balido, J. Ries, A. Di Pilla, M. Marin. Palermo, Edizioni Augustinus, 1992. 157 pp., L. 25.000.

Augustine's early commentaries on Genesis are somewhat neglected in contemporary research. This little volume, the most recent publication of the yearly "settimana di studi agostiniani" held in Pavia, introduces them. Gilles Pelland opens with an overview of Augustine's attempts to explain the first chapters of the Bible (15-54). Giuseppe Balido examines the logical structure of Augustine's various exegeses of Gen. 1, 24-25 (55-61). In the following section two studies are devoted

to the Churchfather's first work on Genesis: Julien Ries discusses 'La création, l'homme et l'histoire du salut dans le *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* de Saint Augustin' (65-97) and Alessandra Di Pilla gives an *excursus* on 'La prezenza del *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* di Agostino nell'*In principium Genesis* di Beda' (99-113). Marcello Marin concludes with an article on Augustine's second work on Genesis: 'Il *De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber*' (117-151).

These essays are welcome and useful, all the more so because of the relative scarcety of studies on these works of Augustine. As early as 1972 Pelland published his *Cinq études d'Augustin sur le début de la Genèse*, but in this new survey he also shows himself to be acquainted with several recent studies. Ries has written many publications on Manichaeism and Augustine, and in this book Augustine's reaction to the opinions of his former coreligionists is a central theme as well. One only wonders why, in this rather sketchy contribution, the author repeatedly ascribes the edition of the Manichaean *Kephalaia* to C. Schmidt (71: here H. Ibscher is also mentioned; 73; 74; 76), while it is well known that this work was edited by Polotsky and Böhlig. Besides, not every researcher will agree with his description of the Manichaean Three Times (94). Di Pilla has carefully investigated the (important) influences of *De Gen. c. Man.* on Bede's *In principium Genesis*, thus producing a study analogous to the one by Siniscalco on *De Gen. ad litt.* and Bede's *Libri IV in principium Genesis* (in *Miscellanea A. Trapè*, 1985). More than once in this article Di Pilla is able to supplement the references to *De Gen. c. Man.* in Ch. W. Jones' 1967-edition of Bede's work in *CCL* CXVIIIA. Marin, for his part, can conclude his solid introduction to *De Gen. ad litt. lib. imp.* with a considerable list of emendations to the recent Italian translation of this work in the *Nuova Biblioteca Agostiniana* (Roma 1988).

NL-3703 AH *Zeist*, Van Renesselaan 24 J. VAN OORT

Samuel N. C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, Band 63). Tübingen, Mohr 1992. XXII and 370 pp., DM 148,—.

This book of Dr. Lieu already has its own history. More than a decade ago, the author published *The Religion of Light: an Introduc-*

tion to the History of Manichaeism in China, Hong Kong 1979. In 1981, this introductory overview of Eastern Manichaeism was followed by L.'s doctoral dissertation in litterae humaniores for the University of Oxford on both Eastern and Western Manichaeism (*The Diffusion and Persecution of Manichaeism in Rome and China: a Comparative Study*; unpublished). Out of this thesis grew the publication which established L.'s name worldwide as a leading Manichaeologist: *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China: a Historical Survey*, Manchester 1985. The book was not only welcomed by the specialists as the first 'comprehensive, exhaustive history of the Manichaean religion from its origin to its end' (W. Sundermann in *BSOAS* 1987, 401-403; cf. e.g. H.-J. Klimkeit in *ZRGG* 1986, 370-372 and H. J. W. Drijvers in *VC* 1987, 399-402), but it also opened the eyes of many for the importance of Manichaeism in world history. However, it soon turned out that this impressive publication, which was reprinted in 1988, could not function as a definitive treatment of the subject. First and foremost, because this field of research is in a state of flux due to important new discoveries, text-editions and innovating studies (a considerable number of them by L. himself). On the other hand, however, because the book also contained an enormous amount of typographical errors. The latter could not be emended by a short list of *Corrigenda* in the first edition, nor by a fuller but also incomplete one in *BJRL* 1986, 469-472. The book, its author and above all its subject surely deserved much better treatment. Opportunity for this was given to L. during a stay in Tübingen (1989-1990) and two years later the long-awaited second edition could appear in Martin Hengel's well-known series *WUNT*.

Although the book's Table of Contents indicates virtually no changes (the most conspicuous one is the wording 'Baptists' instead of 'Elchasaites' in the heading of Ch. II,2), in several respects this revised, expanded and updated edition is a new work. The most important improvements are L.'s largely new treatment of Mani's teachings in I,7; his thoroughly rewritten and newly substantiated Ch. II 'The Apostle of Jesus Christ' (in particular its §2 on the 'Baptists' and §4 on Mani's first journeys); and some passages in the chapter which is entitled 'Mani the Buddha of Light' and gives the early history of Manichaeism in China. A great advancement—and without any doubt essential for a scholarly work like this—is the new layout with footnotes instead of endnotes. In addition, the fact that besides Greek now also Coptic and Syriac could be cited in its 'original' characters is worth mentioning.

It is not our aim to give a full and new introduction to L.'s work here, nor to discuss its great merits at length. All this has been sufficiently done by others, particularly in the substantial reviews mentioned above. As regards their criticism, it may be observed that more than once L. has reformulated his argument in this light or substantiated his view with further evidence. Nevertheless, in the still hotly debated question of Mani's sources and of a supposed predominance of Iranian influence in particular, L. firmly maintains his position. In this connection, one passage excellently expresses the core of his scholarly opinion and therefore deserves to be quoted in full: 'Mani was undoubtedly a syncretist but his religious background was predominantly Judaeo-Christian, as is revealed by the newly discovered texts [e.g. the *Codex Manichaicus Coloniensis*]. The view once commonly held of his fusing together elements of Christianity, Zoroastrianism and Buddhism to create a world religion which was all things to all men must now be decisively abandoned. As we shall see [cf. esp. Ch. VII and Ch. VIII], the Zoroastrian und Buddhist elements were acquired in the course of mission and were not fundamental to Manichaeism. The study of Manichaean origins underlines the diverse and heterodox nature of early Syriac Christianity and the extent to which it was subjected to both Judaising and gnosticising influences' (69).

Although several important remarks have been adduced by earlier reviewers, there are still points which demand some correction, further discussion and additional evidence, or simply deserve our special attention:

pp. XIII-XVII: Abbreviations; 305-317: Primary sources. It remains unclear to me why editions of sources such as *Hom.*, *Keph.* and *Ps.-Bk.* are listed with their full bibliographical data in the first section, together with such a peculiar 'abbreviation' as *MCPCBL*, while among the Primary sources a subdivision 'Coptic sources', 'Arabic sources' and even 'Iranian sources' is lacking. This is rather confusing for the nonspecialist and the details of an important source edition such as the often quoted one of B. Dodge (*The Fihrist of al-Nadīm: a Tenth-Century Survey of Muslim Culture*, I-II New York & London 1970) are not given anywhere. The full details of *MCPCBL*, however, can only be found s.v. Giversen among the *Secondary* sources, which is rather strange for this facsimile edition of the Manichaean Coptic Papyri in the Chester Beatty Library. In short: a new arrangement of the (so-called) Primary sources in particular seems advisable.

p. 8: The German Turfan expeditions did not begin in 1904 but in 1902; 1904 was the starting point of the *second* one (cf. p. 240). To do justice to the historical facts, it should also be remarked that Albert Grünwedel was the first

to conduct an expedition; only after him came the more successful Albert von Le Coq.
p. 23: In the line of perfect men (Seth, Noah, Abraham, Shem, Enosh, Nikotheos, Enoch, Buddha, Zoroaster, Jesus, Mani) the place of Abraham in particular is curious. This name seems to occur only in Arabic texts; however, from e.g. Augustine's works and the Long Formula of the Renunciation of Manichaeism we know that the Manichaeans insulted Abraham and other Old Testament patriarchs.
p. 32 n. 163: In the last full line of the quotation from Simplicius's *In Epict. Encheir.* 27 the words ἄλλο νομίζουσιν have been omitted.
p. 39 n. 38: The reference to J. Maier, 'Zum Problem der jüdischen Gemeinden Mesopotamiens', 60-61, is inadequate. Neither here nor somewhere else in this article does M. substantiate L.'s view. Elsewhere, too, L. shows a tendency to tacitly harmonize divergent scholarly opinions (e.g. p. 84).
pp. 65-66: Not all scholars will agree with the characterization of both the *Gospel according to Thomas* and the so-called 'Hymn of the Pearl' in the *Acts of (Judas) Thomas* as 'gnostic'.
p. 70: L. rightly follows the new reading of *CMC* 123, 9-12 (*inter alia* τροφὴν for νύμφην!) and accordingly gives his new interpretation.
p. 71 n. 195: *ZPE* 1982, pp. 36-37 instead of pp. 34-36. Here and elsewhere (e.g. 73), the print-out from the machine-readable version of the *CMC* provided by L. Koenen (cf. pp. XI-XII) does not give the necessary difference between lacunae in the parchment and illegible traces of letters.
p. 75, end of the first section and n. 213: Mani's reference to John 3,19 is worth mentioning.
pp. 76-77: An important passage from the *Keph.* translated in English for the first time. Elsewhere, too, we find noticeable parts of the Coptic Manichaica retranslated or translated in English for the first time. The same goes for several Greek, Latin, Syriac and Chinese texts.
pp. 80-85: A new and excellent discussion of Mani's *Book of the Giants* and its background. In the meantime John C. Reeves has provided further evidence; see 'An Enochic Motif in Manichaean Tradition', in: A. van Tongerloo & S. Giversen (edd.), *Manichaica Selecta* (FS J. Ries), Lovanii 1991, 295-298 and especially his monograph *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony. Studies in the 'Book of Giants' Traditions*, Cincinnati 1992 (a thorough revision of the author's dissertation, 1989).—What is most striking is the similarity between Mani's *Book of the Giants* (which carried the title of *Kawān* in Central Asia) and some Aramaic fragments from Qumran, even to the extent that, in the *Kawān*, the fertility of the earth in Messianic times is also mentioned!
p. 98: Possidius, in his *Vita Augustini* 15, does not say that the Manichaean merchant Firmus was converted by a *Sunday* sermon. In this connection, it may also be remarked that the editor's name of the widespread American edition of this *Vita* is H. T. Weiskotten, not Weisskoten (98 n. 92; cf. e.g. 192 n. 2) or Weisskotten (312). Since 1919, however, new and in some respects better editions have been published by Pellegrino (1955) and Bastiaensen (1975).
p. 109: I am eager to know why L. dates Mani's death to 26 February, 274 or 276 (cf. e.g. p. 115). A. Böhlig (*Die Gnosis*, III, *Der Manichäismus*, Zürich-

München 1980, 309-310) gives sound reasons for either 14.2.276 or 28.2.276 or (most probably; cf. Böhlig, 'Manichäismus', *TRE* 22, Lfrg. 1, 1991, 30): 26.2.277; the same applies to W. Sundermann ('Studien zur kirchengeschichtlichen Literatur der iranischen Manichäer, III', *AoF* 14, 1987, 51-53), who also gives preference to 26.2.277.

p. 116: Here a reference to Arrigoni's study on the Manichaean missionary Bundos might have been expected. This study is listed in the Bibliography (317), but as far as I can see quoted nowhere.

p. 119: It is doubtful whether there are 'Psalmoi Sarakōtōn' in the Manichaean *Psalm-Book* which do not touch on Manichaean doctrine. Robert Murray does not say so in the studies referred to here, but judges *inter alia* 'that early Manichaeism [as reflected in the Coptic texts] retained some features from its Judaeo-Christian matrix'.

pp. 131-132: The sixth catechetical lecture of Cyril of Jerusalem was not delivered 'to the catechumens who were baptised *on Holy Saturday*'. Besides, one would be pleased to read some substantiation for the supposition that, in Jerusalem, former Manichaeans had to renounce Mani publicly before they could be baptized.

p. 153: It is said too quickly that Cicero's *Hortensius* is now lost; see e.g. L. Straume-Zimmermann, *Ciceros Hortensius*, Bern-Frankfurt 1976.—From this page onwards read 'Monnica' for 'Monica'.

p. 161: Jesus in Manichaeism did not simply possess *three* separate identities, but five (cf. E. Rose, *Die manichäische Christologie*, Wiesbaden 1979) or even six (N. A. Pedersen, 'Early Manichaean Christology, Primarily in Western Sources', in: P. Bryder (ed.), *Manichaean Studies* [...], Lund 1988, 157-190).

p. 167: It is difficult to agree with the assertion that 'the Old Testament was a topic which Augustine would studiously avoid in his debates with Manichaean leaders after his conversion'. There is some reticence, indeed, in works like *C. Fel.* and *C. Fort.*, but the preponderance of NT-texts here will be especially caused by the argument of the Manichaean opponents. In any case, another picture emerges already from *C. Adim.* and *C. Sec.*, and a wholly different one from a work like *C. Faust.*

p. 170: The suggestion of J. Ries to consider one of the Coptic Manichaean Bema Psalms (9,3-11,32 Allberry) to be a liturgical version of the *Epistula fundamenti* seems to be untenable; see already E. Feldmann, *Die 'Epistula Fundamenti' der nordafrikanischen Manichäer: Versuch einer Rekonstruktion*, Altenberge 1987, 2, and particularly G. Wurst, 'Bemapsalm 223—eine liturgische Version der *Epistula Fundamenti*?', in: Van Tongerloo & Giversen, *Manichaica Selecta*, 391-399.

p. 173: As in the first ed., it is said that Augustine arrived in Rome to start a new career in 397; this should, of course, be 383.

p. 176: It was not a priest who comforted Monnica, but a Catholic bishop who once was a Manichaean.—The idea that the miniaturised form of the *CMC* would point to a prophylactic use has been abandoned in recent research.

p. 182: Does the fact that, in the *CMC*, Mani's father is consistently referred to as οἰκοδεσπότης necessarily point to any Manichaean title or office? I prefer to think of a function within the Judaeo-Christian baptist community, similar

to or even identical to the Qumranic office of מבקר (mebaqqer). Cf. J. C. Reeves, 'The "Elchasaite" Sanhedrin of the Cologne Mani Codex in Light of Second Temple Jewish Sectarian Sources', *JJS* 42 (1991) 68-91. This then gives further evidence for the supposition that the section *CMC* 140,8-143,18 has not been preserved in its right place.

p. 184 n. 150: In the quotation from Aug., *Conf.* V,10,18 the—in this context important and in the main text translated—words 'aliam in nobis peccare naturam et delectabat superbiam meam' have dropped out.

p. 187: It is difficult to support the idea that the Manichaean solution to the problem of evil was a successful *by-product* of Mani's teaching. Since in certain Jewish and Judaeo-Christian circles a rigid monotheism was taught (see e.g. the *Pseudo-Clementines*: Satan is God's left hand; adversary and affliction also come from God), it seems highly probable that it was against such a monotheism that Mani protested by 'philosophically' proclaiming his radical dualism.

p. 189: Sermons by Elpidius? The *sermones* by a certain Elpidius in Carthage (Aug., *Conf.* V,11,21) were most probably public debates or public lectures: '... Elpidii ... *coram* loquentis et disserentis sermones...'.

p. 192: Hippo Regius as modern Bôn in Tunesia? Read: modern Annaba (formerly Bône) in Algeria.

p. 245 n. 16: It is highly interesting to read—although only in a note—that according to Y. Yoshida ('Manichaean Aramaic in the Chinese Hymnscroll', *BSOAS* 46, 1983, 326-331) the second of the phonetically transcribed hymns in the Chinese *Hymnscroll* from Tun-huang is diglottal, i.e. Parthian and *Aramaic*.

p. 246: With regard to the Chinese *Compendium* Lin Wushu now argues (e.g. 'The Origin of "The Compendium of the Teaching of Mani, the Buddha of Light" in Chinese', in: Van Tongerloo & Giversen, *Manichaica Selecta*, 225-232) that this document was *not* translated into Chinese, but was originally composed in that language by Manichaean missionaries in China.

p. 248: Striking parallels between Chinese and Coptic texts, which again testify to the great care with which the Manichaeans preserved their sacred writings.

p. 254: The supposition of Erik Peterson to see the Manichaean concept of the Father of Four Faces (ὁ πατήρ τετραπρόσωπος) as influenced by or even originating from Jewish sources is worth serious consideration; cf. E. Peterson, 'Jesus bei den Manichäern', *TLZ* 23 (1928) 243.

p. 263ff.: Particularly Chapter Nine on Manichaeism in South China from the ninth to the sixteenth centuries provides unique information to the majority of 'Western' scholars. Here mention is made of *inter alia* a *Sutra of the Dual Principles (and Two Assemblies)* and even of a writing among the sect of 'vegetarian demon worshippers' known as *The sermon on the transformation of the entire earth*. Still, at the late date of ca. 1600, the Manichaeans in South China possessed a clear self-identity—although they were often confused with the Nestorian Christians by the officials in particular—and venerated as two of their principal deities Primordial Thought (i.e. Primal Man) and Jesus (*I-shu*).

pp. 305-352: As already signaled above, the reader of this highly valuable book will encounter more than a modicum of typographical errors and/or omissions.

This is understandable, but nevertheless somewhat flaws the work. Especially in the Bibliography such deficiencies come to the fore; here we only note the following corrections: F. *C.* Burkitt (306), Aug. c. adv. leg. et proph., new ed. in *CCSL 49*; de haer., ed. Vander Plaet*se*; Ps. Clem. Rom., homiliae, ed. R*eh*m, *Irmscher and Paschke* (308; also 42 ff.); Didymus Alex., edd. Binder and Gr*o*newald (309; not Gr*ü*newald, p. 182 n. 139, nor Gr*ö*newald); Philo Judaeus, page numbers 414-42 for 10-100 and vv (312); I. de Beauso*br*e, *repr. Leipzig 1970* (318); Gi*ll*es Quispel (320 and elsewhere); Br*u*ckner (320; also 154 ff. and elsewhere); Brunner, ZDMG 130 *(1980)* (321); Coyle's art. referred to on p. 40 is not listed (322); Dölger, 'Sonne und Christus i*m* Manichäismus', Antike und Christentum, *Bd.* 2, Münster 19*30*, pp. 3*01*-314 (324); Drijvers, OrChrAn *221* (324); Feldmann, Altenber*g*e (325); Frend, *Roman North* Africa (325); Gropp, Walds*ch*midt (328); Harnack, without *Die* (329); Henning, *Hymnus* (329); Koenen, *in Light of* (333); Luttikhuizen, Evidence *for...by* Jud*e*o-Christian (325); MacKenzie, XL*III* (335); Nagel, Die an*tim*anichäischen Schriften; Habilitationsschrift; Bemer*k*ungen; Tr*eu* (337); Oerter, *1967* to be omitted (338); Polotsky, *H.J.* (339); Quispel, *Istanbul* (340); Reeves, *in Light of* (340); Säve-Söderbergh, U*pp*sala (341); Tardieu, *D*ieu...; *The* to be omitted (347); Tengstr*ö*m (347; idem p. 203 and elsewhere); Van den Broek (ed.), *Studies in* Gnosticism (348); Vööbus, *The* to be omitted (348).

These relatively minor criticisms, however, are by no means intended to belittle the value of this impressive publication. Lieu has provided us with a very fundamental, comprehensive and richly annotated book which excellently introduces into and also will further present-day study of Mani and his syncretistic gnostic-Christian world religion.

NL-3703 AH *Zeist*, Van Renesselaan 24 J. VAN OORT

Antonio Acerbi, *L'Ascensione di Isaia. Cristologia e profetismo in Siria nei primi decenni del II secolo* (Studia Patristica Mediolanensia 17). Milano, Pubblicazioni dell'Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, 1989. xii, 327 pp. L. 50.000.

In the same year in which Antonio Acerbi published his study of the *Ascension of Isaiah*, C. Detlef G. Müller published his contribution "Die Himmelfahrt des Jesaja" in W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* II, 5. Aufl. Apostolisches, Apokalypsen und Verwandtes, pp. 547-562, in which he announces a critical new edition of the text of the *Ascension of Isaiah* by Antonio Acerbi. Acerbi's monograph is the result of his critical study of this text, in which he comes to conclusions that are totally unlike the views forwarded by C.

Detlef G. Müller, who presents the traditional opinion. The *Ascension of Isaiah* is a composite work consisting of the *Martyrium of Isaiah* (chs. I-V) and the *Ascension of Isaiah* (chs. VI-XI) with two Christian interpolations of later date, III,13-V,1 and XI,2-22, which respectively refer to the Saviour and His twelve Apostles and to the birth of Jesus as son of Joseph and Mary and his crucifixion. Both interpolations may be the work of the Christian redactor of the entire work, who lived probably in Alexandria during the second half of the second century C.E. The *Martyrium of Isaiah* is a Jewish writing which might stem from the Qumran community. The *Ascension of Isaiah*, on the contrary, was a Christian writing from the second century which the redactor used and interpolated. Manichaean circles were responsible for the tradition of the final work, which was in use with various other heretical groups.

Antonio Acerbi makes a fresh start with the study of the *Ascension of Isaiah* without basing himself on the common suppositions regarding this work and its composition from Jewish and Christian texts. The leading question is: why Christian eschatological and christological concepts are put into the mouth of an Old Testament prophet like Isaiah, whereas normally they are proclaimed by the disciples and apostles. In which milieu and in which period does such a treatise find its origin; what is its intended public and which specific doctrine does it proclaim? In a very careful and detailed analysis of the *Ascension of Isaiah*, Acerbi treats these problems in nine chapters, comparing the AI with a wide range of contemporary Jewish and Christian writings. In the final chapter he gives his conclusions, in which he discards the idea of a Jewish *Urtext*. The AI is the result of a re-reading (rilettura) of certain Old Testament passages. The *Martyrium* is based on the stories about King Manasseh and the corruption in Judea and Samaria as told in I and II Kings. The apocalypse in Ch. 4 is a re-reading of Isaiah's prophecy on Babylon; ch. 6 is based on traditions regarding ancient prophetism, whereas chs 7-11 and Isaiah's ascension into heaven and the christological revelations combine Isaiah 6 and 52,13ff. Within this context, apocalyptic ideas of a continuous fight between God and His Beloved and the Satan or Anti-Christ (Beliar) find their place. The origin of the various concepts and ideas cannot be ascribed to a Jewish *Urtext* and later Christian interpolations. Indeed the treatise, in its present form, is an amalgam that originates in a milieu in which these ideas were current in certain circles that used them for specific theological

purposes. A certain stratification in the AI can however be detected; in particular ch. 3,13-31 and 4,19-22 are due to a polemic of certain Christian prophetic circles against their opponents in the nascent ecclesiastical establishment. But the main body of the text, especially the *Martyrium* and the *Ascension*, forms an ideological unity. Acerbi seeks the origin of the AI in the Syrian region around Antioch, where Christianity absorbed many Jewish ideas, in the period between 100 and 130 C.E. The AI as such is an important witness of the ongoing christological debate in the second century and of the way it used Christianity's Jewish heritage, in particular the charismatic interpretation of the Old Testament.

Acerbi's interpretation of the AI is highly convincing and has the merit of viewing this writing as an ideological and religious whole originating in specific circumstances and in a specific milieu. The way in which the Manicheans used the AI also indicates a Syrian origin. In this milieu, the Manicheans took over a whole range of writings, among them in particular apocalyptic texts such as the *Book of Henoch*. The dualism of God and Satan makes the AI fit for a Manichean re-reading and easily suits the Manichean cosmological dualism. Acerbi's learned monograph is a *Fundgrube* of interesting information on various early Christian and Jewish writings and is in the first place a coherent interpretation of an enigmatic text. It is a basic book for everybody interested in the intriguing period of the early second century in which the Christian community took a more definite form and different groups struggled with each other. Prophecy and apocalyptic has always been a mighty weapon in this ideological fight.

Department of Languages and Cultures of the Middle East
University of Groningen
Oude Kijk in 't Jatstraat 26
9712 EK *Groningen*

H.J.W. DRIJVERS

John Dillon, *The Golden Chain*. Studies in the Development of Platonism and Christianity. [With Addenda et Corrigenda, Index]. Collected Studies Series 333. Variorum, Aldershot, 1991. Pp. xii + 322, Pr. £ 43.50.

Rules which do not allow of exceptions are not sensible. The rule in *VC* is that of collected studies only the contents are listed. D.'s collec-

tion is so good to have that the present exception is justified. The volume contains an unusually high number of studies, viz. twenty-eight. D. indeed is a master of the short, crisp, thoughtful paper from which one does not only learn something but which (rare thing!) it is also fun to read. The majority of these one had seen before, but others, published in collective volumes such as e.g. *Religious Imagination,*[1] had escaped one's notice. Levels of technicality vary; some papers can be safely read by freshmen in philosophy, others are nicely learned. A few printing errors and minor blemishes have not been removed; quotes in German (or Dutch) are not always accurate, and Torhoudt's name (Study IV p. 121 n. 26) is spelled thus.

Studies I-III deal with the history of the Academy and that of professional Platonism in general in Antiquity; they are required reading, especially because Dörrie's *Der Platonismus in der Antike*[2] is misleading on these topics. D., carrying on where Lynch and Glucker had left off,[3] demonstrates that we really do not know very much about the Academy as an institution and that its activities, especially in its early period, must have been minimal. It is also good to see D. distinguishing the various currents in Middle Platonism and to hear him speak of its "Pythagorean wing"; on this aspect Dörrie is muddled as well. Study IV, a tour de force, is about functional principles in Platonism that are female (one notices with some pleasure D. p. 114[4] side-stepping the fact that μονάς in Greek is female as to grammatical gender but explicitly said to be male at Aët. I 7.30 = Xenocrat. fr. 15 H. (cf. also Hippol. *Elench.* I 2.6)). Gnostic Sophia according to one of D.'s more enjoyable quips is "the first feminist. Her activity is not really evil, just radically misguided" (p. 120). As to Plato's famous or infamous *agrapha dogmata*, we may I believe include 'tenets not explicitly expressed/attested in writing (i.e. in the dialogues)' but deducible from things said there by means of *interpretatio*, or perhaps rather to be postulated as the principles to which what *was* said could be reduced; we need not think of oral communication or teaching only (p. 109 n. 4, a fairly common view). Collections of such points of interpretation may have been made by Plato's pupils, for Aristotle *Phys.* IV 2.209b14-5 speaks of 'the unwritten tenets, *as they are called*' (τοῖς λεγομένοις ἀγράφοις δόγμασιν). Study V, which pursues a topic studied earlier by J. Whittaker,[5] deals with *variae lectiones* in the direct and indirect witnesses to the Plato text as possible traces of tampering for ideological reasons. Study VI successfully defends Merlan's thesis that Iamblich.

De comm. math. sc. ch. 4 derives from Speusippus against Tarán's criticisms. Study VII, which deals with Xenocrat. fr. 15 H. = Aët. I 7.30, in my view is the least successful piece in the collection because D. discusses this passage without heeding its Aëtian context. This does not mean that his remarks about the difficult *constitutio* and interpretation of the text do not deserve consideration, but one cannot put what is in Aëtius on a par with what is in e.g. Aristotle or Plutarch. Aët. I 7.30 is as good a guide to the theology-cum-metaphysics of Xenocrates as *ibid.* I 7.31 is to that of Plato, or I 7.32 to that of Aristotle. Study VIII is a good discussion of the differences and similarities of Stoic and Peripatetic ethics by means of a study of *metriopatheia* vs *apatheia*; it is also illuminating on Stoic philosophy of mind. Studies IX-XI are case-studies dealing with Philo of Alexandria, who is firmly and convincingly placed in the context of Greek thought. What is interesting is that the majority of Greek parallels are later or even much later, so that the study of Philo helps us to date to say the late Hellenistic period pieces of doctrine we otherwise would have to date much later. One does not, of course, agree as to every detail; e.g. Study IX p. 4 D. momentarily forgets that Eudorus is interpreting what Aristotle says about the two Pythagorean systems in *Met.* A. The Appendix to Study X on the other hand is too modest; I would say and have that agreement on points of doctrinal information between Philo and Cicero points to an earlier tradition shared by both. Study XII rewardingly distinguishes the various motives and causes involved in the plurality of explanations (positive as well as negative) of the descent of the soul to be found in Middle Platonist and Gnostic authors. But at p. 360 Alcinous should now be distinguished from Albinus. Study XIII is a lucid introduction to Plutarch of Chaeronea as a Platonist (I must however disagree as to the "Persian origin" of the cosmic dualism invoked p. 218). Study XIV assembles the fragments of (or rather references to) the huge commentary in twenty-four books on Plato's dialogues by Atticus' pupil Harpocration, and provides these with comments. This evidence enables one to understand the nature of the pre-Neoplatonic commentary literature a bit better: words and phrases were discussed and explained; ethics was important; problems of interpretation (traditional or not) were given special attention, solutions suggested (*problemata kai luseis*). Study XV is an ingenious note concerned with the year of death of Nicomachus of Gerasa. Study XVI deals with a doctrine of Two Intellects referred to by Arnobius *Adv. nat.* II 25[6] and, as D. argues,

also to be found in the *Oracula Chaldaica* and interpreted in the Neoplatonic commentary on the *Parmenides* ascribed to Porphyry by P. Hadot, and in Calcidius. Something similar is ascribed to Theodorus of Asine by Proclus. D. plausibly suggests that behind all this may be an allegorization of the second horse of the divine chariot (*Phaedr.* 246a), since a transcendent God or gods had to be able to contemplate our world in an a-temporal way. Study XVII is a review of R. Turcan, *Mithras Platonicus* (Leiden 1975); I note in passing that, *pace* p. 81, Diogenes Laërtius in his preface opposes Orientalism and that, *pace* Turcan and D. (p. 80), the Persians called the μεσίτης by the name of Mithra and not conversely (Plut. *De Is.* 369E). Studies XVIII-XIX are about Origen and the (Neo-)Platonists; they are of especial interest, because Origen (just as Philo of Alexandria) may be our earliest authority for a doctrine that is only attested in later pagan writers. In Study XVIII D. shows that the doctrine of three grades or levels of virtue expressed by Plotinus is anticipated in Origen and only very dimly present in Philo, so probably derives from second-century Platonism. Study XIX similarly shows that a (rather far-fetched) theory of noetic sense-perception or "spiritual sense" found in Plotinus is anticipated in Origen. Study XX, on the other hand, shows that a version of the theory of the three classes of men at *Enn.* V 9 [5] 1 is already found at Philo *Gig.* 60-1; D. points out what this doctrine has in common with and (more importantly) in what respects it differs from the well-known emblematic descriptions of the three types of life.[7] A very close parallel is that of the three Gnostic types of men as at e.g. *Excerpta Theod.* 54; accordingly D. not implausibly suggests that Philo picked up the idea in Gnosticizing Jewish circles. Studies XXI-XXIII are again focused on Origen and Later Neoplatonism. In Study XXI Origen's view of the various *modi operandi* of the members of the Trinity at *De princ.* I 3 is compared with Procl. *Elem. theol.* prop. 53 and passages such as Olympiodorus on *Alcib.* I 115a, and roots are found in second century Platonism. Study XXII studies the light imagery in Orig. *De princ.* I 1. D.'s solution to the vexing problem of Origen's complex relation to Greek philosophy is that he may be called a "Neo-Christian", i.e. a person who transforms Christian ideas under the influence of philosophical esp. Platonic thought but remains first and foremost a Christian thinker. Study XXIII deals with name magic, or magic names, in Origen and later Platonic writers.[8] Study XXIV, on transcendental imagination (φαντασία) in Plotinus, is a sort of companion piece to Study XIX. Study

XXV discusses *Enn.* III 9 [13] 1 from the point of view of its interpretations by later Neoplatonists. Study XXVI plausibly argues that the doctrine of the divine henads originated with Iamblichus. Study XXVII is a brief treatment in depth of Proclus' interpretation of the dialectic method of the second part of Plato's *Parmenides* as an all-comprising diaeresis which orders our intuitions in a rational way, which Proclus holds to be superior to Aristotle's method for the selection of premisses for each subject advocated at *Anal. pr.* I 27.43b1 ff.[9] (note the full diaeretic scheme set out p. 175). Study XXVIII, finally, instructively attempts to distinguish image (εἰκών), symbol (σύμβολον) and analogy (ἀναλογία) as actually used in Neoplatonist *interpretation*.

3723 KB *Bilthoven*, Obrechtlaan 57 J. MANSFELD

[1] Ed. J. P. Mackey (Edinburgh 1986).

[2] Bd. I-II (Stuttgart 1987-1990); a review of mine is forthcoming in *Mnemosyne*. I note however that at Study XIV (originally published 1971) pp. 126 f. (cf. also *ibid.* p. 146) D. has forgotten to correct his statement that Atticus "was head of the Platonic Academy in the mid-second century A.D."

[3] J. Lynch, *Aristotle's School: A Study of a Greek Educational Institution* (Berkeley 1972); J. Glucker, *Antiochus and the Late Academy* (Göttingen 1978).

[4] See also Study XII p. 357: "the primal entity (which is invariably male ...". It would be more to the point to say that the female μονάς and the neuter ἕν may be *conceived as* male.

[5] See now also J. Whittaker, *The Value of Indirect Tradition in the Establishment of Greek Philosophical Texts or the Art of Misquotation*, in J. N. Grant (ed.), *Editing Greek and Latin Texts*. Papers Given at the Twenty-Third Annual Conference on Editorial Problems, Univ. of Toronto, 6-7 November 1987 (New York 1989) 63 ff.

[6] P. 176 n. 1 is not entirely correct, because C. Marchesi in his first ed. emended to *potentias genuinas* and in his second keeps the text as transmitted, viz. *post mentes geminas*.

[7] R. Joly, *Le Thème philosophique des Genres de Vie dans l'Antiquité Classique* (Bruxelles 1956) 181 ff. discusses *Enn.* V 9 [5] 1 and parallel passages in Plotinus, but *ibid.* 173 f. has missed Philo *Gig.* 60-1.

[8] He has missed H. Hirschle, *Sprachphilosophie und Namenmagie im Neuplatonismus*: Mit einem Exkurs zu 'Demokrit' B142, Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie H. 96 (Meisenheim am Glan 1979).

[9] Wrong reference at p. 171 (28.50b1-12).

Autour de Tertullien, Hommage à René Braun, Tome 2. Textes réunis par Jean Granarolo avec la collaboration de Michèle Biraud (Publication de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines de Nice, 56), 1990.

Bibliographie des travaux de René Braun; J.-Cl. Fredouille, De l'*apologie de Socrate* aux *apologies* de Justin; C. Tibiletti, Il problema della priorità

Tertulliano-Minucio Felice; P. Petitmengin, Errata tertullianea; P. Nautin, Tertullien, *De spectaculis* 26,4; G. Azzali Bernardelli, *De quaestionibus confessionum alibi docebimus* (Tertulliano, *Cor* 1,5); Ch. Munier, Remarques sur le texte du *De pudicitia* de Tertullien; A. Schneider, Note sur la tradition manuscrite de Tert. *test.* 4,1; A. G. Hamman, L'homme, image de Dieu chez Tertullien; P. Siniscalco, *Anima sine materia stabili.* Per la storia dell'interpretazione di alcuni passi di Tertulliano (*Apol.* 48,4; *Test.* 4,1); P. Mattei, Le schisme de Tertullien, essai de mise au point biographique et ecclésiologique; W. Rordorf, Tertullien et les *actes de Paul* (à propos de *bapt.* 17,5); Y. M. Duval, Sur un prétendu fragment d'un traité perdu de Tertullien chez Jérôme (*Ep.* 85,5). Les enfants de chrétiens: «candidati fidei»; J. Fontaine, Un «paradis» encore bien classique: le prélude du poème *De aue Phoenice* (v. 1-29)»; J. Doignon, Un proverbe de Salomon retouché par Hilaire de Poitiers pour les besoins de la «connexion» des deux testaments; J.-P. Weiss, Une oeuvre de la Renaissance carolingienne: *la passion de Pons de Cimiez*; M.-L. Constantini, Tertullien, Nietzsche: Deux sombres précurseurs.

Recherches et tradition. Mélanges patristiques offerts à Henri Crouzel, s.j., sous la direction d'André Dupleix (Théologie Historique 88). Paris, Beauchchesne, 1992.

Avant-propos par Jacques Dutheil. Introduction par André Dupleix, F. Crouzel, Le Père Henri Crouzel; J. Bernardi, La lettre 104 de saint Basile. Le préfet du prétoire Domitius Modestus et le statut des clercs; L. Brésard, Aelred de Rievaulx et Origène; R. Cabié, Le dimanche et le temps pascal au temps d'Origène; J.-P. Cattenoz, La philanthropie divine dans l'oeuvre de Jean Chrysostome; A. Dartigues, Chair phénomènologique et chair spirituelle; M. de Durand, Les Trois Fêtes; A. Dupleix, Jean Chrysostome. Un évêque social face à l'Empire; J.-J. Fauconnet, Pour une morale de la signification; M. Jourjon, De trois banalités origéennes; E. Junod, L'auteur de l'*Apologie pour Origène* traduite par Rufin; S. Légasse, Firmicus Maternus, les mystères et la sotériologie paulinienne; G. Pelland, A propos d'une page d'Origène. In Jn 2, 16-18; H. Pietras, Il fondamento ecclesiologico della posizione di Dionigi di Alessandria nella controversia battesimale; J.-R. Pouchet, Le combat pour la paix des Églises. Un Leitmotiv épistolaire de saint Basile; A. Quacquarelli, Riflessioni sul gesto (*actio*) di alcune scene della iconografia evangelica dei primi secoli; Ch. Renoux, L'Assomption de Moïse. D'Origène à la chaîne arménienne sur les Epîtres Catholiques; J. Rius-Camps, El *Peri Archon* Segun El Codice 8 de la Biblioteca de Focio; G. Ruiz, «Ma puissance se déploie dans la faiblesse» II *Cor*, 12,9). Une interprétation d'Irénée de Lyon; M. Simonetti, Origene e i mercanti nel tempio; D. Vigne, Enquête sur Basilide; Bibliographe d'Henri Crouzel.

ΣΟΦΙΗΣ ΜΑΙΗΤΟΡΕΣ. 'Chercheurs de sagesse'. Hommage à Jean Pepin. Publié sous la direction de M.-O. Goulet-Cazé, G. Madec, D. O'Brien (Collection des Études Augustiniennes. Série Antiquité 131). Paris, Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1992. XXXIV, 715 p.

Préface (VII-X): Tabula Gratulatoria (XI-XV); Bibliographie de J. Pepin (XIX-XXXIV); Y. Bonnefoy, "Lis le livre!" (1-3); M.-O. Goulet-Cazé, L'*Ajax* et l'*Ulysse* d'Antisthène (5-36); P. Aubenque, De l'égalité des segments intermédiaires dans la Ligne du livre VI de la *République* (37-44); M. Dixsaut, La dernière définition du Sophiste (*Sophiste* 265a10-268d5) (45-75); M. Narcy, La leçon d'écriture de Socrate dans le *Phèdre* de Platon (77-92); J.-L. Cherlonneix, L'âme de Platon et ses deux corps (93-102); J.M. Rist, Plato says that we have tripartite souls. If he is right, what can we do about it? (103-124); C. Rutten, La définition du citoyen chez Aristote, *Politique* Γ 1 (125-132); J. Brunschwig, Pyrrhon et Philista (133-146); J.-M. Flamand, *Deus otiosus.* Recherches lexicales pour servir à l'histoire de la critique religieuse d'Épicure (147-166); R. Goulet, Des sages parmi les philosophes. Le premier livre des *Vies des philosophes* de Diogène Laërce (167-178); J. Whittaker, Goodness Power Wisdom: A Middle Platonic Triad (179-194); J.C.M. van Winden, True Philosophy—Ancient Philosophy (195-201); L. Tarán, The authorship of an Allegorical Interpretation of Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* (203-230); L. Coulobaritsis, Le logos hénologique chez Plotin (231-243); G. Leroux, La trace et les signes, aspects de la sémiotique de Plotin (245-261); R. Mortley, The ignorance of lovers (Plotin V 8,8) (263-274); F. Romano, Natura e Anima in Plotino (275-296); G. Verbeke, Une anamnèse métaphysique chez Plotin (297-316); D. O'Brien, Origène et Plotin sur le roi de l'univers (317-342); H.-R. Schwyzer, Textkritisches zu Plotin und zur *Vita Plotini* (343-346); P.F. Beatrice, Towards a new editon of Porphyry's fragments against the Christians (347-355); J.M. Dillon, Porphyry's doctrine of the One (356-366); G. Madec, Augustin et Porphyre. Ébauche d'un bilan des recherches et des conjectures (367-382); J. Foubert, *Ad gloriam corporis.* Au delà de *Sagesse* 9,15; 'Corpus quod corrumpitur adgravat animam' (*Confessions* VII 17,23) (383-402); C. Viola, "...hoc est enim Deo esse, quod est magnum esse". Approche augustinienne de la grandeur divine (403-420); H.D. Saffrey, Le thème du malheur des temps chez les derniers philosophes néoplatoniciens (421-431): J. Combès, Symbolique de l'intellect dans l'*In Parmenidem* de Damascius (433-450); C. Moreschini, Alcuni aspetti degli *Scholia in Phaedram* di Ermia Alessandrino (451-460); A. Segonds, A propos d'une page du *De aeternitate mundi* de Jean Philopon (461-479); L. Brisson, Le corps 'dionysiaque'. L'anthropogonie décrite dans le *Commentaire sur le Phédon* de Platon (1, par. 3-6) attribué à Olympiodore est-elle orphique? (481-499); D. O'Meara, Vie politique et divinisation dans la philosophie néoplatonicienne (501-510); Y. de Andia, Philosophe et union mystique chez le Pseudo-Denys l'Aréopagite (511-531); R. Rashed, Fūthiṭos (?) et al-Kindi sur 'l'illusion lunaire' (533-557); E. Jeauneau, Le *De Paradiso* d'Ambroise dans le livre IV du *Perpiphyseon* (561-571); S. Gersh, (Pseudo-?) Bernard Silvestris and the Revival of Neoplatonic Virgilian Exegesis (573-593); W. Kühn, Quelle

éthique accepte Dieu? Anselme de Cantorbéry, al-Achʿari, ʿAbd al-Djabbar, Thomas d'Aquin (595-625); G. Folliet, Lucas Holstenius (1596-1661). Un émule de saint Augustin dans sa conversion au platonisme et au catholicisme (627-649); S. Matton, L'intégration en Christ des dieux antiques selon Georges de Venise. Théologie cosmique et théologie chrétienne à la Renaissance (651-676); J. Bertier, Michel Paul-Gui de Chabanon (1730-1792). Un traducteur oublié des *Problèmes musicaux* d'Aristote au siècle des Lumières (677-690); R.-P. Droit, L'Inde des Grecs au XIXe siècle. Quelques remarques (691-703); J.-P. Schobinger, Die Textimmanente Präsenz des Autors (705-711); Table des matières (713-715).

BOOKS RECEIVED

The inclusion of a book in this list, which contains all books received by the editors, does not guarantee its subsequent review.

Arnobii Iunioris Opera Minora. Pars II, cura et studio Klaus-D. Daur (Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina 25A). Turnhout, Brepols, 1992, 352 p.

Instrumenta Lexicographica Latina. Fasc. 73 (SL 25-25A) Series A-Formae. Arnobius Iunior. Opera omnia. Curante CETEDOC. Universitas Catholica Lovaniensis Lovanii Novi. Brepols, Turnhout, 1992. 107 p. + 12 microfiches.

Anonymus Ad Cuimnanum. Expositio Latinitatis. Primi ediderunt Bernard Bischoff et Bengt Löfstedt (Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina 133 D). Turnholti, Brepols, 1992. XLII, 178 p. ("Anonymus" ist der mittlere der drei Donat-Kommentare, die in der Handschrift 2/1 des Benediktinerstifts Sankt Paul in Kärnten vereinigt sind.)

J.H.D. Scourfield, Consoling Heliodorus. A Commentary on Jerome, Letter 60 (Oxford Classical Monographs). Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1993. XXI, 260 p.

Johann Ignaz Pock, Sapientia Salomonis. Hieronymus' Exegese des Weisheitsbuches im Licht der Tradition (Dissert.d.Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz 89). 1992. 442 S.

Christine Modesto, Studien zur Cena Cypriani und zu deren Rezeption (Classica Monacensia 3). Tübingen, Gunter Narr Verlag, 1992. XII, 305 S. DM 96,—.

Gregoire le Grand, Règle pastorale. 2 Volumes. Introduction, notes et index par Bruno Judec, texte critique par Floribert Rommel, OSB, traduction par Charles Morel, S.J., (Sources Chrétiennes 381 et 382). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992. 571 p. 210 + 246 F.

Theodore A. Bergren, A Latin-Greek Index of the Vulgate New Testament (based on Alfred Schmoller's Handkonkordanz zum griechischen Neuen Testament with an Index of Latin Equivalences Characteristic of "African" and "European" Old Latin Versions of the New Testament). Scholars Press, Atlanta, Georgia, 1991.

Robert J. Daly (ed.), Origeniana Quinta. Papers of the 5th International Origen Congress. Boston College, 14-18 August 1989. Leuven, University Press/Uitg. Peeters, Leuven, 1992. XV, 655 p.

Augustinus, De utilitate credendi/Über den Nutzen des Glaubens. Übersetzt und eingeleitet von Andreas Hoffmann (Fontes Christinai 9). Herder, Freiburg usw., 1992. 220 S. DM 36,00.

Bruno-Guigo-Antelm, Epistulae Cartusianae/Frühe Kartäuserbriefe. Übersetzt und eingeleitet von Gisbert Greshake (Fontes Christiani 10). 211 S. DM 36,—.

Vigiliae Christianae 47 (1993), 313-340, © E. J. Brill, Leiden

LA «BIBLE D'ALEXANDRIE» ET LES ÉTUDES SUR LA SEPTANTE

RÉFLEXIONS SUR UNE PREMIÈRE EXPÉRIENCE

PAR

MARGUERITE HARL

Les colloques trisannuels organisés par *l'International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (IOSCS) permettent aux divers centres d'études sur la Septante de confronter les travaux engagés dans des programmes d'édition et de critique textuelle, ou d'études par exemple sur les techniques de traduction, sur la syntaxe et le lexique. La dernière rencontre, à Paris en 1992, réunissait des chercheurs venus d'une bonne quinzaine d'Instituts ou d'Universités.[1] Pour l'équipe française qui avait lancé à la Sorbonne le projet original d'une traduction annotée de la Septante, ce fut l'occasion de situer cette entreprise au sein des autres équipes. Après l'achèvement d'une partie du programme (les livres du Pentateuque parus dans «La Bible d'Alexandrie», 1986-1993),[2] alors qu'une dizaine d'autres livres sont en préparation, cette première expérience invite à quelques réflexions: comment la traduction annotée de la Septante peut-elle contribuer à une meilleure compréhension des questions historiques, linguistiques et exégétiques que pose la version grecque produite par le judaïsme hellénistique?

Une entreprise d'hellénistes universitaires français: objectifs et méthode de la traduction annotée de la Septante

Lorsque, en 1981, un petit groupe de chercheurs décidèrent de préparer une traduction de la Septante, cette entreprise s'inscrivait de façon spécifique dans le milieu de la recherche scientifique des Universités françaises. Les circonstances de la naissance du projet en expliquent les objectifs, les méthodes et les présupposés.

Formés à la culture classique, nous reconnaissions comme exercice scientifique majeur *l'édition, la traduction et le commentaire des textes anciens*. Ce qui est fait pour les auteurs classiques dans la collection des

Universités de France, ce que nous-mêmes avions fait pour Philon d'Alexandrie et pour les Pères de l'Eglise dans la collection des *Sources chrétiennes*, voilà ce qui suggérait la méthode de notre travail sur la Septante: étudier un à un les livres de cet ensemble, chacun dans sa globalité; prendre le texte grec au sérieux, tel qu'il était, en présupposant qu'il avait eu un sens pour son traducteur et pouvait en avoir un pour son lecteur; mettre au point une traduction soigneusement littérale et l'accompagner d'un commentaire sous forme de notes explicatives.

Dans notre tradition philologique, traduire une œuvre ancienne est, après son édition critique, le moyen suprême de montrer comment on en comprend le sens et la valeur. Pour la Septante, nous n'avions pas à établir une édition critique, puisque cette tâche est menée à bien à Göttingen. En revanche, la nouveauté, du moins dans les études philologiques françaises, d'un corpus de livres traduits de la Bible hébraïque impliquait un plus gros effort d'annotation. Cette annotation ne devait pas seulement justifier la traduction et donner quelques explications linguistiques ou historiques: elle devait éclairer l'arrière-fond biblique des textes, situer la Septante dans la littérature du judaïsme hellénistique, signaler les principales orientations exégétiques ou théologiques que prennent les lectures de ce texte grec dans les divers milieux de sa «réception».

Le lancement du projet était favorisé par l'évolution de la recherche scientifique dans les Départements des Lettres. Le moment était enfin arrivé en France où s'élargissaient les limites des études dites «classiques». Nos collègues historiens et hellénistes redécouvraient l'intérêt des périodes qui avaient succédé à l'Antiquité classique et redonnaient sa valeur propre à la culture des siècles hellénistiques; ils s'attachaient à la rencontre entre l'hellénisme et «les sagesses barbares» et plusieurs étudiaient particulièrement le judaïsme post-biblique.[3] De leur côté, nos collègues philologues mettaient de plus en plus en lumière l'histoire continue de la langue grecque, dans son évolution depuis Homère jusqu'au grec moderne, et prenaient davantage en compte, avec les papyrologues et les épigraphistes, la koinè et le grec des Septante.[4] Enfin un excellent historien, H.-I. Marrou, avait inauguré à la Sorbonne, en 1945, un enseignement d'*Histoire ancienne du christianisme* qui ouvrait la porte, de façon tout à fait nouvelle au sein de l'Université laïque, à des études touchant à l'histoire des religions, à l'exégèse, à la théologie, à la patristique. Au sein même de l'Université, les étudiants pouvaient découvrir la Bible, alors que celle-ci était restée, dans ce pays majoritairement catho-

lique, mal connue. Pour un plus large public, études et traductions bibliques se multipliaient et rencontraient un vrai succès.[5] Dans ces conditions propices, je pus regrouper à la Sorbonne, en tant que professeur de «langue et littérature grecques post-classiques», quelques chercheurs pour aborder la Septante.

Ce projet universitaire n'aurait toutefois pas abouti s'il n'avait suscité de l'intérêt dans les milieux proprement attachés à l'étude de la Bible, et en particulier, en France, chez les exégètes catholiques de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament. Ces exégètes accueillirent plutôt favorablement le fait que des universitaires, des laïcs, qui n'étaient pas des biblistes et ne se définissaient pas par des attaches confessionnelles, prennent le relais du travail des clercs, à un moment, il est vrai, où les études bibliques paraissaient en crise: l'intérêt pour les théories «documentaires» qui déterminent des strates dans la rédaction des livres bibliques diminuait au profit d'autres manières de lire la Bible. Beaucoup s'attachaient désormais à l'histoire de la transmission du texte, surtout depuis les découvertes des manuscrits de Qumran. Les témoins prémassorétiques prenaient de la valeur. On étudiait les traditions juives de lecture de la Bible, les targums araméens, les commentaires réunis dans le Talmud.[6] La Septante pouvait entrer de plein droit dans cette histoire des réceptions successives du texte. Pour certains, traduire et annoter la Septante pouvait être envisagé comme un apport à la théologie biblique. Notre projet était en quelque sorte attendu par les milieux mêmes des spécialistes de la Bible.[7]

Notre travail, cependant, n'était pas celui de théologiens ni même, en premier lieu, celui de biblistes. Comme historiens et hellénistes, nous pouvions présenter cette Bible grecque comme l'œuvre d'un milieu et d'une époque, analyser en elle les phénomènes linguistiques de passage d'une culture à une autre, montrer les possibilités qu'avaient les traducteurs, mais aussi les difficultés qu'ils éprouvaient, pour rendre les réalités et les idées hébraïques dans la langue des Grecs, faire enfin connaître ce document dans sa pleine valeur de texte grec, délibérément écrit dans la langue de l'hellénisme. De plus, un aspect de la Septante rarement envisagé dans les études habituelles nous intéressait: après sa naissance et une assez brève vie dans le judaïsme, la Septante avait été la Bible reçue par les premières Eglises chrétiennes, qui lui avaient reconnu l'autorité d'un texte «divinement inspiré». Patrologues de formation, nous pouvions signaler l'origine de quelques-uns des développements chrétiens à partir de ce que la Septante avait en propre, de ses écarts par rapport au Texte Massorétique.

Très vite il fut constaté que ce programme nécessitait pour chaque livre le travail d'une équipe pluridisciplinaire, ou du moins la consultation de divers spécialistes. Dans l'idéal, jamais atteint, il fallait à la fois un helléniste bon philologue, un historien du judaïsme, un bibliste, un papyrologue, un lecteur de la vieille latine et d'autres encore. Très vite aussi apparut le bénéfice d'une mise en commun des problèmes soulevés, de livre à livre, pour que soit mis en lumière ce qui, dans toute la Septante, pouvait être considéré comme des constantes (des procédés identiques, des choix syntaxiques ou lexicaux, des phénomènes de références internes selon la méthode de l'exégèse analogique...), ou au contraire ce qui révélait la personnalité de chaque traducteur, avec ses procédés, ses préférences lexicales et sa culture. Un séminaire réunissant les traducteurs fut dès lors consacré à ces échanges.

Le projet éditorial fut mis au point avec les Editions du Cerf pour les volumes du Pentateuque: il tient compte de nos capacités et de notre public. Utiles pour les études bibliques, nos ouvrages doivent également intéresser un cercle plus large d'historiens, de linguistes, de théologiens, de lecteurs cultivés. Ils doivent donc associer à la rigueur philologique et à l'érudition bien documentée des qualités de clarté et des informations de caractère plus général. Par exemple, nous donnons en marge de notre traduction des titres et des sous-titres qui servent de jalons pour une lecture suivie des livres; dans l'introduction et l'annotation, quelques notices facilitent la compréhension des réalités bibliques. La «Bible d'Alexandrie» ne se veut pas seulement un instrument de travail. Elle peut être aussi une nouvelle traduction de la Bible lue pour elle-même.

Au cours de l'établissement de la traduction et des notes, nous avons rencontré des problèmes qui avaient été envisagés dès le départ mais qui sont devenus, dans la pratique, de plus en plus complexes. L'expérience fait mûrir notre travail, comme on le verra à propos des cinq questions que j'ai retenues pour cet exposé.

1. *Comment traduire? Les problèmes stylistiques. Le «niveau de langue» de la Septante et de notre traduction*

Le premier problème qui se pose à tout traducteur est celui de la reproduction, dans la langue d'arrivée, du «niveau de langue» du texte modèle. La traduction française de la Septante doit, dans la mesure du possible, reproduire le type de traduction qu'avaient choisi les Alexandrins, — type de traduction qui est à reconnaître pour chaque livre, plus

ou moins littéral, plus ou moins sous l'influence de l'hébreu, plus ou moins marqué par la culture grecque. De plus, traduire la Septante, c'est traduire une «Bible». Or la Bible, comme toute œuvre et peut-être davantage, a une «forme» matérielle, sonore, qui n'est pas séparable de ce que l'on peut considérer comme son message: on ne peut rendre compte de la Bible qu'en reproduisant *aussi* ses caractéristiques formelles, non seulement l'écriture particulière des narrations, des lois, des prophéties, des sentences, mais aussi les effets rythmiques et sonores et tous les traits syntaxiques qui définissent son «style». Un texte (et surtout un texte destiné à être lu oralement et appris par cœur) parle par sa forme.[8]

Pour nous qui traduisons une traduction, le problème est double. Avant de rendre la «forme» du texte grec, il faut examiner comment le texte grec lui-même reproduit la «forme» du texte hébraïque: reconnaître dans la Septante des procédés de traduction ponctuels (ceux qui sont actuellement bien étudiés, par exemple pour les conjonctions et les prépositions, l'emploi des modes verbaux, etc),[9] mais aussi analyser sa reproduction du style biblique, c'est-à-dire sa «phrase», l'agencement dans le texte des éléments qui lui donnent son rythme.

Peu d'études ont porté sur la manière dont les divers traducteurs de la Septante ont rendu la «phrase» hébraïque dans sa globalité.[10] L'un de nous, D. Pralon, a proposé une étude du style du *Lévitique* des Septante, en remarquant les «effets» que créait en grec la traduction de l'hébreu. Il a noté, à la fois pour la syntaxe et pour les mots, les effets de langue parlée et familière, les effets d'idiomes, les effets de trope. Tous ces «effets» donnent son «style» à la version grecque.[11] Idéalement, notre traduction doit tenter de produire à son tour dans la langue moderne des marques analogues d'étrangeté ou de familiarité, de langue savante ou populaire, de simplicité prosaïque ou de poésie. Elle devrait même, pour garder le même «niveau de langue», imiter les incohérences grammaticales, les expressions qui ne semblent pas avoir de sens (les «non-sens»), les faits de langue qui, en grec, tranchaient, détonnaient, par rapport à l'usage commun.

La première observation, pour le Pentateuque du moins, est que la phrase grecque décalque presque continuement la phrase hébraïque, — pour l'ordre et le nombre des mots, la construction des verbes, la parataxe ou la subordination, etc. —, au prix de manquements aux règles du «bon grec» et en donnant un texte parfois seulement «acceptable».[12] Les Septante ont fait subir à la phrase grecque des entorses syntaxiques

et stylistiques qu'il semble difficile de décalquer en français: la langue grecque de la koinè était probablement plus tolérante pour des formes nouvelles, dialectales, populaires que ne l'est la langue française. Nous avons fait l'expérience des limites du «mot à mot» en français: le texte devient illisible à force d'incorrections; nous avons renoncé, entre autres, à utiliser des constructions du parler populaire moderne (l'équivalent, par exemple, de ce qu'écrit le grec, comme l'hébreu, en donnant en fin de proposition un pronom pléonastique, du type «les villes dans lesquelles ils habitaient *en celles-ci*).[13] C'est une déception, mais nous avons décidé de choisir un «niveau de langue» (française) sans galimatias syntaxique, pour correspondre à l'attente d'un public moins habitué aux textes «mal écrits» que les destinataires du travail de nos prédécesseurs alexandrins, rompus aux mélanges linguistiques des milieux cosmopolites.[14] Et nous n'ignorons pas que notre traduction, celle d'une Bible encore en usage chez les chrétiens orthodoxes de rite grec, peut un jour à servir pour la liturgie.[15]

Tout en recherchant une langue française lisible, le traducteur moderne peut rendre compte de bien des caractéristiques du texte grec: assez souvent (mais pas toujours) nous pouvons garder le nombre des mots, leur qualité et leur ordre dans la phrase; reproduire les successions de propositions en parataxe ou les phrases très longues qui enchaînent une série de propositions finales; conserver les formules de relance du récit («et il arriva que, après ceci..., alors...»); les particules qui soulignent un fait émotionnel (ἰδού, «et voici...»); marquer une rupture de construction; respecter les redondances, les répétitions, les parallélismes, les chiasmes.[16] Nous expliquons parfois en note pourquoi nous ne pouvons pas le faire: par exemple, nous ajoutons le verbe «être» dans les phrases nominales, trop inhabituelles en français, mais nous perdons ainsi malheureusement l'effet de brièveté (*Deutéronome* 18,2, κύριος αὐτὸς κλῆρος αὐτοῦ, «le Seigneur lui-même (sera) sa part d'héritage»); pour dégager le sens d'un verbe grec composé, nous utilisons deux mots, augmentant ainsi la longueur du texte (en *Proverbes* 4,8, où le grec forme un chiasme original avec deux verbes pareillement préfixés, nous écrivons: «*Entoure-la-d'une-palissade*, elle t'exaltera; honore-la, pour qu'*elle t'entoure-de-baisers*»); pour le tour intensif qui utilise si souvent, en grec comme en hébreu, la figure étymologique, nous avons renoncé à traduire, par exemple, «par disparition tu les feras disparaître» (*Deutéronome* 7,2) et avons écrit «tu les feras disparaître complètement».[17] Cependant, à mesure que nous progressons dans la traduction, notre

souci devient plus grand de reproduire le style des Septante. Hors Pentateuque, les livres seront probablement traduits de façon plus littérale.

Le plus difficile est de trouver des équivalents sonores: certes, le grec n'a pas pu restituer les sonorités du texte hébreu, dont le rôle est si important, notamment pour les noms propres et leurs jeux d'assonance avec des noms communs. Nous avons signalé en note ces insuffisances du grec et n'avons pas cherché à faire mieux. Ces pertes sonores sont très nombreuses dans tous les livres bibliques (voir par exemple en *Genèse* 17,5 et 17 le traitement des noms «Abraham» ou «Isaac»). Par ailleurs, le grec a ses propres sonorités, à leur tour rarement imitables en français. Ainsi, au début du Cantique de Moïse (*Deutéronome* 32,1-2), si l'on peut rendre la longueur des stiques avec le nombre et l'ordre des mots, comment faire entendre l'assonance des finales donnée par la répétition du pronom possessif au génitif? Terminer les stiques par «ma bouche», «ma proclamation», «mes paroles» (car nous ne pouvions écrire: «la bouche de moi», «la proclamation de moi», «les paroles de moi») n'est pas l'équivalent sonore de στόματός μου, ἀπόφθεγμά μου, ῥήματά μου, qui fait effet de rime, comme le suffixe possessif hébreu *-y* en finale des stiques.

Pour le lexique, également, se pose la question de la fidélité non pas au sens des mots (dont je parlerai plus loin), mais à leurs marques propres dans l'ensemble du vocabulaire, aux écarts qu'ils produisent par rapport à l'usage contemporain des Septante, à leurs «effets» dans le style. Par exemple, si un mot rare ou unique en hébreu a été rendu par un mot rare ou unique en grec, il faudrait le traduire par un mot rare ou unique en français. De même, pour les néologismes du grec, il faudrait créer des mots nouveaux en français. Nous y renonçons, quittes à choisir parfois des mots un peu rares, que nous justifions en note (par exemple, dans l'Introduction au *Lévitique*, p. 39-40, est justifié l'usage du vieux mot français «apanage» choisi pour rendre l'emploi nouveau dans la Septante de κάρπωμα). Nous évitons les mots usuels attendus lorsqu'ils ne rendent plus «l'effet» que faisait le mot dans le texte grec. Ainsi nous traduisons κιβωτός par «coffre» pour nommer ce que l'on appelle communément l'«arche» de Noé parce que le mot «arche», venu du latin *arca* qui désigne un coffre, a perdu dans la langue moderne le pouvoir d'évoquer une construction en forme de coffre. Nous ne traduisons pas προσήλυτος par «prosélyte» mais par «immigrant» parce que le mot grec, à l'époque de la traduction, ne faisait pas l'«effet» d'un terme technique (Introduction à l'*Exode* p. 51-52). Dans la formule liturgique

de *Deutéronome* 26,2, nous aurions dû choisir pour κάρταλλος un mot plus rare que «corbeille», — par exemple «bourriche» —, puisque ce mot grec se distingue de deux ou trois autres mots désignant des corbeilles. Pour les mots poétiques, pour les emprunts à des lexiques techniques ou dialectaux, il faudrait trouver dans la langue moderne des équivalents qui puissent marquer pareillement le texte de leur caractère particulier. Le vocabulaire des Septante pour les *realia* est riche, précis. Par exemple, nous avons été frappés, en étudiant des récits de combat, par la technicité du lexique des armes, qui fait appel à des termes propres aux diverses ethnies des armées hellénistiques (par exemple γαῖσος en *Josué* 8,18 serait le nom d'une arme des mercenaires galates). Pour la végétation et l'agriculture, la consultation des papyrus ou des *Géoponiques* nous permet seule de préciser l'usage particulier, local, de certains mots. Il ne s'agit pas de rappeler ici, répétons-le, le respect nécessaire du sens des mots, mais de prêter attention au «niveau» de langue qu'ils révèlent.

2. *Les problèmes textuels. Comment tenir compte des différents états textuels de la Septante?*

Nous avions décidé de traduire la Septante selon le texte publié par Rahlfs qui se trouve aisément entre les mains de tous. C'était une décision de simplicité et de réalisme. L'édition de Göttingen en cours de publication ne donnait pas encore tous les livres. Cependant, pendant que nous traduisions le Pentateuque, paraissaient les cinq volumes édités par J.W. Wevers (1974-1991): nous ne pouvions pas ignorer plus longtemps l'apport considérable de leurs deux apparats critiques, pour les variantes des manuscrits et pour celles des réviseurs. Il était ainsi possible non pas seulement de traduire le texte reconstitué comme le plus ancien mais de prendre intérêt à l'histoire du texte dans ses états successifs.

Les spécialistes du texte hébreu, qui utilisent la Septante en tant que témoin privilégié d'un modèle pré-massorétique, s'appuient sur la forme la plus ancienne du texte grec. Cette forme est d'une importance considérable pour l'archéologie du texte hébreu, surtout lorsqu'elle révèle un substrat, son modèle, en accord avec le texte des manuscrits de Qumran[18] ou d'autres témoins. En revanche, pour les historiens de l'exégèse biblique fondée sur la Septante, l'attention doit tout autant se porter sur les différents états du texte grec qui furent à la base des inter-

prétations au cours des siècles de sa transmission. Nous avons donc une double tâche: nous attacher, comme les éditeurs de Göttingen, à rendre compte du texte le plus ancien de la Septante, — le texte tel qu'on le suppose sorti des mains du traducteur —, mais aussi préciser ses formes textuelles successives qui peuvent expliquer les variantes des citations, notamment dans le Nouveau Testament et chez les Pères. L'histoire du texte grec dans son devenir retient toute notre attention. Connaître les variantes du texte permet de comprendre la vitalité de la Septante, que nulle règle n'a fixée dans une forme *ne varietur* et dont on observe la vie dans les différentes communautés qui l'ont reçue.

Ces deux exigences, — traduire le texte restitué dans son état le plus ancien et faire connaître le texte réellement lu par tel exégète —, sont parfois en contradiction: l'état le plus ancien de la Septante n'est pas toujours le texte qui fut lu par les juifs (Philon d'Alexandrie) et par les chrétiens. Faute de pouvoir privilégier une des formes de la Septante qui furent, à divers moments de l'histoire, en divers lieux, des textes réels, comme le fut, par exemple, le texte «antiochien»,[19] nous pouvons pour le moins signaler les principales variantes du texte dans notre annotation. Pour les livres historiques, dont l'histoire textuelle est très complexe, il sera difficile de décider quel état du texte doit être retenu. Pour certains livres, il faudra envisager la traduction des deux états connus, fort différents entre eux (les deux textes de *Daniel*, certaines parties de *Josué* et des *Juges, Job* avec ou sans les versets de Théodotion). Pour le Pentateuque, dont le texte grec est relativement stable et pour lequel il n'existe pas de texte «antiochien», nous n'avons pas eu de tels problèmes. Toutefois l'édition de Wevers corrige sur des centaines de points le texte de Rahlfs. Elle fait apparaître, par exemple pour le *Deutéronome*, qu'au cours de ses copies, la traduction primitive a été allongée par la répétition des formules stéréotypées, qu'elle a reçu des mots supplémentaires, que le découpage des sections a été modifié par l'addition ou la suppression d'un mot de coordination.[20]

L'évolution des états textuels de la Septante n'importe pas seulement pour l'histoire de l'exégèse. Lorsqu'il s'agit de décrire la syntaxe, on peut hésiter, comme nous l'a fait remarquer T. Muraoka,[21] entre prendre pour base la forme textuelle dernière, révisée, corrigée et en quelque sorte *authentifiée* par ses utilisateurs, ou bien rechercher la syntaxe d'une Septante ancienne *reconstituée*. Il en est de même pour le lexique, qui doit enregister aussi bien les mots des corrections et révisions successives que les mots supposés appartenir à la Septante primitive.

Les leçons hexaplaires que donne le second apparat des volumes de Göttingen (de façon plus assurée que l'édition de Field, qui est à refaire) sont des témoins essentiels pour comprendre l'évolution de la langue grecque de traduction (ce n'est plus tel mot grec, mais tel autre, que l'on utilise pour rendre tel objet ou telle idée de la Bible hébraïque: par exemple «rendre profane» ne se dit plus βεβηλοῦν mais λαικοῦν; le beau-père ne se dit plus γαμβρός mais πενθερός; les idoles ne sont plus nommées «objets de dégoût», βδελύγματα, mais εἴδωλα)[22] et, plus particulièrement, pour suivre l'évolution, dans le judaïsme, des procédés de traduction, qui touchent souvent aux problèmes d'interprétation. Faites en Palestine, sans doute sous l'influence des maîtres pharisiens, les corrections ou les choix différents de mots montrent souvent une réaction contre le grec des Alexandrins, ou, du moins, une distance prise par rapport à ce grec, peut-être aussi une réaction contre certaines de leurs interprétations. Le phénomène le plus apparent, bien connu des septantistes, est la tendance chez les traducteurs ou réviseurs ultérieurs à rester plus près de l'hébreu. Nous citons quelques mots d'Aquila qui montrent comment un traducteur littéraliste pouvait utiliser (ou créer) des mots grecs d'une même famille pour rendre des mots se rattachant en hébreu à une même racine,[23] ce qui révèle, en contraste, la plus grande liberté des premiers traducteurs. Théodotion et Symmaque, eux, ont le souci d'un lexique plus classique, «plus clair» (comme le dira Eusèbe de Césarée): leurs leçons permettent de souligner, également en contraste, l'étrangeté ou l'archaïsme du lexique des Alexandrins. Par exemple en *Deutéronome* 30,9 pour rendre l'idée de «faire prospérer», les réviseurs donnent des verbes plus usuels (πληθύνειν, αὐξάνειν) que celui de la Septante πολυωρεῖν. Notre annotation, qui ne peut être exhaustive, signale quelques-unes des leçons de Théodotion, d'Aquila et de Symmaque. Elles illustrent l'évolution des styles de traduction de l'hébreu en grec au cours de trois ou quatre siècles, et, depuis qu'Origène les a fait connaître par ses Hexaples, elles ont enrichi les commentaires de quelques Pères grecs.

3. *Les problèmes sémantiques: le sens des mots. Un lexique de la Septante est-il possible?*

Le traducteur de la Septante se doit de fixer, pour chaque mot, à l'intérieur des phrases, le sens qui lui paraît le plus juste. Selon quels critères se décidera-t-il? Les lexiques classiques n'accordent malheureusement pas aux mots de la Septante une place suffisante. Le plus usuel

(Liddell-Scott-Jones) est ancien et n'a pu bénéficier, malgré le bon supplément de E.A. Barber en 1968, des nouveaux documents qui enrichissent notre connaissance du grec post-classique (inscriptions, papyrus, textes littéraires). Ces documents permettent d'insérer les exemples de la Septante dans la langue commune, au lieu de les mette à part au titre de «septantismes». Faut-il refaire le lexique de J.F. Schleusner (1820-1821) et établir un lexique propre à la Septante? Le danger est d'isoler ce grec de la langue profane, comme on le fait trop souvent encore pour la langue du Nouveau Testament.[24]

Depuis plusieurs années quelques savants mènent une réflexion sur la possibilité d'établir un lexique de la Septante. Ils proposent, à titre d'essais, la rédaction de notices pour certains mots. Un lexique a même été publié (pour sa première moitié) par une équipe réunie autour de J. Lust.[25] Notre expérience de traducteurs nous montre cependant les difficultés rencontrées pour établir un tel lexique.

Les lexicographes de la Septante se partagent entre deux attitudes principales à l'égard de ce «grec de traduction».[26] Les uns (peut-être le plus grand nombre) lisent les mots en les considérant dans leur rapport avec le mot hébreu supposé sous-jacent, enclins à reconnaître un sens qui reflète ce mot; ils s'appuient essentiellement sur l'alignement mot à mot des deux textes, l'hébreu et le grec, la comparaison étant facilitée par les moyens informatiques: nombre de «sémitismes» lexicaux sont ainsi relevés.[27] Les autres soulignent au contraire tout ce qui, dans le grec des Septante, appartient authentiquement à la langue grecque et s'explique par l'un des sens dérivés du sens fondamental d'un mot. Sans nier les décalques et les réels sémitismes lexicaux, notre lecture se rattache à cette seconde conception: le vocabulaire des Septante nous apparaît dans son ensemble usuel dans le monde hellénistique, prenant un des sens possibles du mot dans l'histoire de la langue grecque, choisi pour être largement compris, tourné vers la langue des «récepteurs». Notre premier instrument de travail est le *Dictionnaire Etymologique de la Langue Grecque* de Pierre Chantraine qui décrit d'abord le sens fondamental d'un mot, avant d'énumérer les nombreux sens dérivés. Nous nous appuyons aussi sur la connaissance actuellement plus grande que l'on a de la koinè hellénistique, notamment par les inscriptions, par la papyrologie (des papyrologues travaillent avec nous et, en Italie, des papyrologues réunis autour d'A. Passoni Dell'Acqua étudient la Septante), par les précieux recueils des *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* publiés par G.H.R. Horsley, par les études des linguistes,

celles de J. Barr (ses remarques sur «la sémantique du langage biblique», faites à propos des dictionnaires théologiques du Nouveau Testament, méritent d'être également appliquées aux études lexicales de la Septante), de J.A.L. Lee, de T. Muraoka, de M. Silva, d'autres encore. Nous partageons notamment l'idée de ces linguistes qui dénonçent la fiction d'un «Jewish Greek» ou mettent en garde contre une assimilation trop rapide du vocabulaire des Septante à celui du Nouveau Testament.[28]

Sans doute, pourrait-on soutenir que les mots de la Septante peuvent être lus des deux manières: ou bien en privilégiant ce que l'on croit être le «sens pour le traducteur», un bilingue qui a le texte hébreu en tête, ou bien en privilégiant le «sens pour le lecteur», seulement hellénophone, coupé de l'hébreu.[29] Nous n'avons malheureusement aucun moyen de savoir ce que *pensait* l'un et l'autre de ces personnages. De plus, une telle conception du sens suppose, chez le traducteur et chez le lecteur, une saisie du texte par mots isolés, sans appui sur le contexte de la phrase, ce qui est linguistiquement peu vraisemblable. En réalité, les deux sens, celui de la langue grecque commune et celui que le mot tiendrait de l'hébreu, n'existent que de façon théorique..., pour le lexicographe! Le traducteur et le lecteur avaient une perception du sens des mots dans la phrase où ces mots figurent. Quant au traducteur moderne de la Septante, lui non plus ne traduit pas des mots isolés mais des phrases. Il suit le mouvement d'écriture du traducteur ancien, qui donne aussi le mouvement pour la compréhension du lecteur; il constate que le sens d'un mot se découvre vraiment au moment où s'établit son rôle au milieu des autres éléments de son contexte, qui va jusqu'au chapitre, au livre, et même à tout l'ensemble des livres (d'où notre insistance sur la nécessité de traduire *tout* le texte de la Septante!).

Une argumentation en faveur d'un lexique de la Septante est l'existence d'un certain nombre d'équivalences fixes entre l'hébreu et le grec. On peut montrer, par exemple, que, dans une certaine mesure, le vocabulaire du Pentateuque a servi de lexique pour les traducteurs ultérieurs.[30] Ces traductions stéréotypées, reprises dans plusieurs livres, sont toutefois relativement peu nombreuses. A travers toute la Septante, les deux lexiques, l'hébreu et le grec, n'ont pas entre eux de correspondances fixes: les mots sont choisis en fonction de chaque contexte, selon la compréhension du traducteur. De plus, — il est utile de rappeler cet enseignement banal de la linguistique —, le nombre des mots et leur répartition pour un même champ notionnel ne sont pas identiques dans les différentes langues.

Un même mot grec rend, en divers endroits, des mots hébreux différents (pour repérer cette absence de fixité, reconnaissons l'utilité de la concordance de Hatch-Redpath, quelles que soient ses insuffisances). Ce mot unique peut avoir en grec le sens qui convient à chaque contexte. Le lexique donnera vraisemblablement plusieurs équivalents modernes pour rendre compte des substrats hébreux différents. Quant à nous, traducteurs de la phrase, nous gardons le même mot, lorsque le lexique français le permet, pour respecter le lien lexical propre au grec qui invite le lecteur à rapprocher ces versets pour une interprétation analogique.[31] Il n'est malheureusement pas toujours possible de trouver dans la langue française un mot qui puisse jouer pareillement ce rôle de lien entre divers passages. Ainsi la version grecque utilise le mot ἀνατολή, surtout connu, au pluriel, pour nommer le lever du soleil, ou le soleil levant lui-même, pour rendre le mot hébreu *çèmaH* dans trois textes prophétiques qui annoncent la levée d'un «germe» (*Zacharie* 3,8 et 6,12; *Jérémie* 2,5-6). Le verbe ἀνατέλλειν sert à rendre les deux racines hébraïques *zaraH* et *çèmaH* qui signifient soit «le lever» du soleil, soit «le lever» d'une plante. L'usage d'ἀνατολή au sens d'une «pousse» végétale est attesté dans la Septante même (*Ezéchiel* 16,7; 17,10) et chez Philon. Les lecteurs, toutefois, font le rapprochement avec les textes qui promettent «le lever» d'un astre (*Nombres* 24,17) ou «le lever» du soleil de justice (*Malachie* 4,2) et le nom ἀνατολή, comme titre du Christ, sera généralement pris au seul sens de «Soleil levant», selon l'usage dominant en grec, dans l'oubli de l'image végétale pourtant correctement rendue par ἀνατολή. En *Zacharie* et *Jérémie*, les autres traducteurs, Aquila et Symmaque, donnent des mots propres à la végétation (ἀναφυή, βλάστημα). Pour rendre compte de l'usage par la Septante d'un mot unique, ἀνατολή, nous aurions besoin en français d'un terme qui vaudrait à la fois pour la pousse qui se lèvera et pour le soleil levant.

Inversement, plusieurs mots grecs sont utilisés par les traducteurs pour rendre un même mot hébreu: ces mots ne sont pas pour cela en grec parfaitement synonymes! Ils éveillent pour le lecteur des connotations diverses et devront être rendus diversement dans les langues modernes. Ainsi dans l'expression hébraïque qui revient huit fois dans le livre des *Nombres* (et déjà en *Exode* 30,12) pour dire «faire le compte» des Hébreux, le mot *ro'sh*, «tête», qui prend le sens de «totalité», «somme totale» des hommes, est rendu par quatre mots différents: ἀρχή (l'expression λαμβάνειν ἀρχήν, décalque de l'hébreu, réel sémitisme, est difficilement compréhensible en grec), κεφάλαιον (un autre équivalent de

ro'sh au sens de «somme totale»), ἀριθμόν (par assimilation avec le mot hébreu présent dans un autre verset), συλλογισμόν («le compte», terme bien grec choisi par le traducteur de l'*Exode*). Ces quatre mots ne peuvent recevoir une traduction unique sous le prétexte qu'ils sont tous quatre utilisés pour *ro'sh*. Cet exemple illustre de plus l'impossibilité de procéder avec certitude à une rétroversion du grec à l'hébreu, que l'on tente parfois pour conjecturer à partir d'un mot grec le mot hébreu qui était probablement son modèle.

Lors du passage de l'hébreu au grec, les traducteurs ont étendu l'emploi de quelques mots grecs, plus que nous ne pouvons le faire dans une langue moderne. Un lexique enregistre les divers contextes où se révèle le décalque de l'hébreu. Quant au traducteur, il peut hésiter à décalquer à son tour le mot grec ou à le rendre de façon plus adaptée. Ainsi l'équivalence fixe entre *nèphèsh* et ψυχή pour nommer le «souffle vital» entraîne une extension des usages du mot grec que ne peut avoir le mot «âme» en français dans tous les cas. Certes, le mot ψυχή, comme *néphèsh* en hébreu, peut selon l'usage grec désigner «quelqu'un», «la personne» qui a fait telle chose: cet emploi peut être adopté en français au prix d'un archaïsme (voir quelques expressions anciennes du type: «vingt millions d'âmes», «ne pas trouver âme vivante»). Mais le mot ψυχή décalque des emplois métonymiques de l'hébreu plus étranges dans une langue moderne. Ainsi, il en arrive à désigner la partie du corps par où passe le souffle vital, la *gorge* de quelqu'un, par exemple dans les contextes d'eau et de soif (*Jonas* 2,6 «les eaux m'ont entouré ἕως ψυχῆς», cf. *Psaume* 68,2; *Nombres* 11,6, «notre ψυχή est sèche», cf. *Psaume* 61,2). En gardant le mot «âme», nous permettons de comprendre certaines interprétations patristiques, qui ont vu ici une opposition de l'âme et du corps. Une extension de sens plus étonnante encore se lit dans des contextes d'impureté: le mot ψυχή, accompagné ou non du participe «morte», nomme «la personne» (morte), c'est-à-dire le cadavre dont l'approche est une souillure (*Lévitique* 19,28; 21,1 et 11, repris en *Nombres* 6,6 et 11). Nous pouvons hésiter entre garder le mot «âme» («une âme morte»?) et traduire par «une personne».

Les traducteurs alexandrins prennent parfois des mots dans des sens anciens, disparus dans l'usage au profit d'un sens devenu dominant. Certains mots, considérés comme ayant rendu l'hébreu de façon inexacte, ont *peut-être* été employés correctement, avec un sens se rattachant à un usage ancien. Pour comprendre le sens de certains mots de la Septante, le lexicographe doit rechercher dans *toute* la langue grecque

des emplois anciens (attestés chez Homère, les Tragiques, les poètes) ou marginaux (attestés dans les dialectes, chez Aristophane). Ainsi, le mot διαθήκη est réputé ne pas traduire exactement *berit*, «alliance», parce qu'il signifie habituellement «dispositions testamentaires»; les traducteurs, dit-on, auraient pu prendre par exemple συνθήκη; leur choix peut cependant s'expliquer par une expression ancienne dont on trouve la trace chez Aristophane (*Oiseaux* 439: le coutelier Panétios conclut «un pacte» avec sa femme). Le préfixe διά rappelle parfaitement le sens et le rite principal de tout pacte dans la Bible: une séparation entre deux parties pour que soient gérés de façon distincte des biens jusque là communs, qu'il s'agisse d'alliance entre hommes (Laban et Jacob, Abraham et Melchisedech) ou entre les hommes et Dieu.[32]

Certains mots grecs créent une illusion de sens. Ce sont souvent des mots bien connus parce qu'ils sont passés en transcription dans la langue française. Mais leur sens originel est oublié: alors qu'ils étaient employés dans la Septante de façon neutre, pour un sens non spécialisé, ils ont reçu par la suite des connotations religieuses ou techniques nouvelles. C'est par exemple le cas de προσήλυτος, mentionné plus haut, que nous traduisons non pas par «prosélyte», terme technique pour un statut postérieur à la Septante, mais par «immigrant»; ou celui de διασπορά, qui nomme la «dispersion (*Deutéronome* 28,25) c'est-à-dire un «exil» (*Isaïe* 49,6) et non pas la communauté des dispersés que nous appelons «la Diaspora». En revanche, nous avons gardé, peut-être à tort, la traduction d'ἀνάθεμα par «anathème», parce que le mot grec a déjà dans le Pentateuque son sens technique, mais cette transcription se fait au détriment du sens réel du mot grec: «objet voué à la destruction», «tabou» (voir la note sur *Lévitique* 27,28, la notice dans le Lexique de J. Lust et l'Introduction au *Deutéronome* p. 61). Il est possible que les prochains volumes de «La Bible d'Alexandrie» modifient cette traduction.

4. *La comparaison de la Septante et du Texte Massorétique*

La question la plus connue et la plus étudiée par les septantistes est celle du rapport de la version grecque à l'hébreu, plus précisément au texte hébreu qui était le modèle proposé aux traducteurs, un texte prémassorétique. Jusqu'à une époque récente, l'intérêt principal de la Septante résidait dans ce rôle de témoin. Lorsque nous avons décidé de traduire la Septante, nous nous proposions de la lire pour elle-même,

comme une œuvre ayant sa pleine valeur de texte, sans la juger au titre de «traduction». Cette prise de position n'interdisait pas, bien au contraire, une comparaison avec le texte plus tard fixé par les massorètes, puisque la comparaison est le moyen de mettre en valeur l'indépendance littéraire de la Septante et son originalité: les divergences qui séparent les deux traditions textuelles, l'hébraïque et la grecque, révèlent les caractères propres à chacune.[33] Une partie de notre annotation a donc pour objet d'étudier ces divergences: après les avoir repérées jusqu'au plus petit détail par un alignement complet des deux textes, il s'agit de les classer, d'établir leur ordre d'importance pour notre projet, de les expliquer lorsque cela est possible, et enfin d'en montrer les conséquences exégétiques. Seuls les cas les plus significatifs sont retenus pour des notes.[34]

Les divergences sont à nos yeux d'importance inégale selon qu'elles changent ou non le sens de la phrase. Certaines, les plus menues, sont souvent des phénomènes de traduction visant à la clarification du texte. En prenant l'exemple des sections narratives de l'*Exode*, J.W. Wevers a mis en lumière cinq caractéristiques d'une traduction qui se veut principalement respect d'un texte considéré comme canonique: les retouches du modèle répondent au souci d'exactitude minutieuse, à la recherche de la clarté, de l'homogénéité, de la non-contradiction dans le large contexte du livre et de toute la Tora, de la correction théologique. La Septante n'est pas une version glosée, paraphrasée, à la manière d'un Targum.[35]

Outre ces phénomènes d'actualisation, de clarification, d'harmonisation, nous relevons en traduisant la Septante quantité d'autres petites divergences imputables peut-être au passage du système grammatical d'une langue dans celui d'une autre. Nous les regroupons dans l'Introduction pour ne pas encombrer à l'excès nos bas de page. Ainsi, au futur de l'hébreu correspond le plus souvent un impératif du grec (TM, «tu les passeras en revue»: Septante, «passez-les en revue»); quelques mots pluriels en hébreu sont rendus en grec par des singuliers (par exemple le mot désignant le ciel); le traducteur ajoute un pronom grammaticalement indispensable en grec, etc. Ces modifications grammaticales, lorsqu'elles ne supposent pas un modèle hébreu différent et ne modifient pas le sens, illustrent le souci rédactionnel du traducteur. Si on les étudie non pas chacune séparément mais toutes ensemble, elles permettent une appréciation globale de la version et peuvent faire découvrir la cohérence littéraire d'un livre.[36]

D'autres divergences sont plus importantes et méritent d'être présentées dans les notes: il y a, par exemple, des déplacements de versets ou de parties entières de livre (les divergences sont alors considérables, comme à la fin de l'*Exode*, dans les livres des *Règnes*, dans *Jérémie*; elles donnent lieu à des études particulières); le grec ne découpe pas toujours le texte comme l'hébreu (en l'absence d'alinéas dans les manuscrits grecs, seule l'étude des mots de liaison ou des formules présentatives permet d'établir les sections de lecture, non sans hésitation chez les éditeurs: voir des exemples dans le *Deutéronome*, signalés dans l'Introduction p. 79-80).

Les divergences de sens doivent être appréciées exactement dans les notes. Lorsqu'un mot grec dit autre chose que le mot hébreu probablement sous-jacent, il entraînera des exégèses différentes de celles qui se fondent sur le texte hébreu. On peut parfois expliquer les écarts par des fautes de lecture du traducteur (nous en signalons quelques exemples dans les notes; les phénomènes de confusion ou de permutation de lettres sont bien connus). En d'autres cas, on supposera plutôt une interprétation délibérée du texte: le septantiste se doit d'examiner le sens de chacun des versets différent en grec de ce qu'il est en hébreu alors que les spécialistes du Texte Massorétique prennent en compte le témoignage de la Septante seulement pour les versets qui, en hébreu, sont difficiles à comprendre ou mal tranmis.[37] Nous accordons notre attention à toutes les leçons propres à la Septante, puisqu'elles établissent «l'originalité» de cette version. Par exemple, en *Deutéronome* 30,3 où le TM est généralement compris au sens de «YHWH Elohim ramènera votre captivité» (avec un jeu de sonorités entre *shūb* et *shebūt*), la Septante donne: «le Seigneur guérira tes péchés». R. Le Déaut admire cette «belle transposition» et la rapproche de l'interprétation du Targum: «la Parole de YHWH accueillera votre repentir». Les livres du Pentateuque fournissent bon nombre d'exemples de ces divergences. Elles seront plus nombreuses encore chez les Prophètes, par exemple en *Isaïe*, comme l'ont déjà fait connaître plusieurs grandes études sur ce livre dans sa version grecque.[38]

Les divergences de sens qui opposent la Septante au Texte Massorétique résultent souvent de procédés déjà en œuvre dans le judaïsme de ce temps, plus tard codifiés dans le rabbinisme. La Septante présente quelques-uns des traits de la tradition juive ultérieure, comme l'ont noté depuis longtemps les septantistes, et, plus récemment, par exemple G. Vermès. On peut rapprocher certaines interprétations de la Septante des

Targums ou d'exégèses d'ouvrages juifs non bibliques, et même de commentaires ultérieurs des midrashim.[39] La Septante n'apparaît pas alors comme une traduction isolée plus ou moins fautive, mais comme une des œuvres du judaïsme post-biblique que l'on peut considérer comme «authentique».

5. *La Septante, le judaïsme «hellénistique» et l'interprétation théologique des chrétiens*

Notre annotation accorde une place assez importante à la «réception» de la Septante par ses lecteurs juifs et chrétiens. Peut-être faut-il en justifier l'intérêt puisque ce problème est rarement pris en compte dans les études septantiques. Quand nos collègues puisent chez Philon, Flavius Josèphe et les Pères Grecs des attestations textuelles de la version grecque qui servent à l'histoire de ce texte, leur projet n'est pas d'en examiner l'interprétation.

La Septante, on le sait, a été l'une des formes du texte biblique lue par les Juifs pendant deux ou trois siècles (on trouve des manuscrits grecs de certains livres bibliques dans la secte de Qumran; Philon et Flavius Josèphe utilisent le grec) et, pour une très longue période, par les chrétiens hellénophones.[40] Les lecteurs ont reçu un texte marqué par l'usage de la langue de l'hellénisme et par quelques exégèses qui lui sont propres. Ce texte est distinct du texte hébreu (c'est *en ce sens* que nous disons qu'il est «original») puisque toute traduction est obligatoirement une interprétation et induit un *nouveau* texte. Il a été reçu par les chrétiens comme «divinement inspiré» et a eu un caractère d'autorité dans les Eglises d'Orient. Nombre de mots grecs choisis par les traducteurs juifs alexandrins ont été adoptés par les chrétiens et forment une base importante de leur vocabulaire.[41]

Les phénomènes de «réception» du texte biblique grec par des lecteurs qui avaient eux-mêmes une culture grecque, méritent d'être connus: ils caractérisent une étape importante dans l'histoire des lectures de la Bible et posent de façon particulièrement nette la question de la rencontre entre la Bible et l'hellénisme. On a souvent insisté, et encore maintenant, sur une «hellénisation» de la Bible dans sa version grecque. Il importe de bien connaître les développements *ultérieurs* fondés sur quelques mots de la Septante pour éviter de projeter ces interprétations dans la Septante elle-même, de façon anachronique, avec une sur-hellénisation et une sur-théologisation des textes. Notre souci est de

situer la Septante exactement à sa place d'œuvre du judaïsme hellénistique, exempte de christianisations indues.

Il convient de préciser en quel sens nous employons l'adjectif «hellénistique» quand nous disons que la Septante est une «œuvre du judaïsme hellénistique»: ce qualificatif renvoie à une *période* de l'histoire du judaïsme, avec ses problèmes particuliers, par exemple les problèmes politiques, comme l'a bien souligné R. Hanhart;[42] il renvoie aussi à un état de la langue utilisée alors par les juifs, véhicule d'une culture, mais non pas peut-être d'une idéologie ou d'une théologie particulières. Les jugements portés sur l'hellénisme de la Bible grecque doivent être nuancés. L'usage d'une langue n'implique pas nécessairement l'adoption des idées exprimées ailleurs par cette même langue. Les linguistes dénoncent l'erreur qui consiste à croire que les mots portent en eux-mêmes une idéologie. En associant exclusivement la Bible à la langue hébraïque, en jugeant que les mots grecs impliquent des idées grecques, certains refusent toute authenticité biblique à la Septante, renouvelant le rejet effectué par le judaïsme au second siècle de notre ère.[43]

Deux arguments plaident en faveur de nos notes patristiques chargées d'éclairer paradoxalement la Septante: d'une part nous montrons que l'«hellénisation» du message biblique, si elle a eu lieu, a été principalement accomplie par les lecteurs de la Septante; d'autre part nous suggérons qu'un texte est plus riche si on ne le sépare pas de sa transmission.

Il est évidemment impossible dans une simple annotation de donner le dossier complet de la «réception» de chaque verset chez ses exégètes anciens. Les volumes de «La Bible d'Alexandrie» offrent une sélection d'exemples, pour illustrer divers aspects de l'interprétation juive ou chrétienne, surtout pour les passages où la version grecque diffère du Texte Massorétique. En présentant ces exégèses, en particulier celles des chrétiens, nous ne visons certainement pas à proposer un commentaire biblique qui serait plus autorisé que d'autres, mais à faire connaître les conséquences théologiques d'une lecture de la Bible faite en grec. Ce que l'on appelle la théologie «alexandrine» (par exemple les idées de Philon sur la création du monde, la nature de l'homme, le rôle du Logos divin, et ces mêmes idées chez Clément d'Alexandrie ou Origène) a son origine non pas dans la Septante elle-même mais dans les interprétations qui en furent faites. Il en est de même pour les idées «chrétiennes» tirées des témoignages septantiques (par exemple des prophéties de la vie de Jésus, les «messianismes»): elles proviennent d'interprétations de versets lus dans une perspective théologique propre au lecteur.[44]

La lecture philonienne du Pentateuque est désormais bien connue, tant se sont multipliées les traductions de Philon et les études sur son interprétation allégorique associée à une authentique foi juive. Nous citons abondamment ses commentaires (à titre d'exemple entre des centaines d'autres, voir les notes sur *Exode* 28 pour l'allégorie cosmologique et le symbolisme moral des vêtements du grand prêtre), parce que Philon est encore au centre des débats sur l'«hellénisation» de la pensée juive.[45]

Nous citons les *Antiquités Juives* de Flavius Josèphe pour leur intérêt linguistique, pour les actualisations, pour les modifications chronologiques qu'il apporte à l'histoire des anciens Hébreux. Pour le Pentateuque, le rapport de F. Josèphe au texte des Septante est encore mal établi.[46]

La lecture chrétienne de la Septante soulève des problèmes beaucoup plus complexes puisque, avec les écrits du Nouveau Testament, on entre dans une autre religion. La Septante, peu à peu arrivée entre les mains des communautés chrétiennes, sous l'une ou l'autre de ses formes,[47] contient ce qui a été dit «aux anciens» (ἀρχαῖοι) alors qu'est proclamée la «nouvelle alliance» (καινὴ διαθήκη). Sont affirmées à la fois la continuité et la rupture des deux «Testaments». La lecture des livres «anciens» se fait principalement selon l'interprétation typologique enseignée par le chapitre 10 de la *Première Epître aux Corinthiens*: les événements rapportés par les livres bibliques donnent la «figure» (τύπος) de ce que le Christ est venu accomplir parmi les hommes. L'intérêt des quelques notes qui accompagnent notre traduction est de mettre en lumière les transformations du texte biblique pris dans le contexte de la foi nouvelle.[48]

Pour les commentaires patristiques, s'il est nécessaire de reconnaître en eux l'influence du texte grec des Septante, d'indiquer aux patrologues l'origine exacte des citations, il faut aussi mesurer ce que les Pères ajoutent au sens en situant les mots dans une culture grecque plus importante que celle des traducteurs Alexandrins. Nous connaissons mal la culture grecque, littéraire ou philosophique, de ces traducteurs, leur degré d'hellénisation. Certains, par exemple le traducteur des *Proverbes* ou celui de *Job*, sont plus cultivés que d'autres. Ils utilisent le vocabulaire philosophique commun à leur époque, par exemple pour la cosmologie, l'anthropologie, la psychologie, les passions. Ces mots appartiennent au vocabulaire des Stoïciens sans que nous puissions découvrir à coup sûr dans le texte des Septante les conceptions stoïciennes du monde

ou de l'homme. Ainsi, pour désigner l'homme, les traducteurs emploient indifféremment, comme en hébreu, les termes «corps», «chair», «âme», sans que ces mots s'opposent en une conception dualiste. En revanche, nous voyons clairement que les «récepteurs» hellénisés de la Septante ont introduit les doctrines grecques à l'occasion du commentaire des textes.[49] Il est de multiples exemples de ces phénomènes d'hellénisation d'un texte qui, en lui-même, l'était moins qu'on ne le croit. En employant le mot κόσμος dans le Pentateuque, le traducteur parle seulement de l'«ornement» de la terre et du ciel; c'est plus tard que seront introduits des développements de type stoïcien sur le *kosmos* (note sur *Genèse* 2,1). Tout autre exemple: le traducteur de *Cantique* 6,5 (peut-être Aquila) a employé le verbe ἀναπτεροῦν pour rendre un verbe hébreu qui semble signifier (au hifil) «inquiéter», «troubler», «stimuler» («détourne tes yeux de devant moi car ils me ...»); peut-être le traducteur a-t-il pris ce verbe dans le sens anciennement attesté (en parlant d'un oiseau) «faire dresser les plumes», «faire s'envolver», «exciter», sans penser pour autant au mythe du *Phèdre* de Platon (ce verbe se lit en 249 d: en voyant la beauté d'ici-bas, l'âme, au ressouvenir de la beauté véritable, «de nouveau douée d'ailes», ἀναπτερούμενος, désire comme l'oiseau s'envoler), mais c'est tout naturellement à ce mythe que renverront les Pères grecs, par exemple Grégoire de Nysse, pour développer à propos de ce mot le thème de l'âme qui «retrouve les ailes» perdues par le péché.

Les spécialistes actuels de la Septante sont de plus en plus réservés sur ce que l'on appelle parfois «la théologie» de la Septante. Personne ne se hasarde à généraliser. La recherche de traits spécifiques se fait verset par verset ou pour des livres particuliers auxquels sont consacrées des monographies.[50] De la même façon, nos notes signalent des inflexions religieuses données au texte (voir par exemple les notes sur le Cantique de Moïse en *Deutéronome* 32), elles soulignent des thèmes favoris du judaïsme post-biblique, comme l'angélologie (voir à titre d'exemple *Deutéronome* 32,8), mais elles ne sont pas regroupées en une synthèse.

Les notes que nous consacrons à la «réception» de la Septante chez les juifs et les chrétiens contribuent surtout à situer cette version dans la continuité des lectures de la Bible. D. Barthélemy avait émis l'idée que la Bible a «mûri» dans la communauté juive d'Alexandrie.[51] Les études sur le judaïsme post-biblique mettent en évidence quelques thèmes privilégiés à cette époque. Les traducteurs grecs de la Torah modifiaient parfois légèrement le texte, afin de mieux rendre ce qu'ils considéraient

comme le sens «canonique» de leur Loi. Quelques exégètes du Nouveau Testament voient dans des modifications le signe d'une «inspiration» et sont prêts à affirmer que la Septante fut une étape providentielle en vue d'une «préparation évangélique».[52]

La Bible hébraïque fut accompagnée par les commentaires rabbiniques. De leur côté, les chrétiens ont interprété les textes sacrés selon leur foi. Ces lectures parallèles sont des témoins de la vitalité du texte biblique. Pour la théologie catholique, l'«Ecriture» ne doit pas être isolée de ses «traditions» de lecture. Certains même souhaitent la reconnaissance de la toute première réception de la Bible, celle qui eut lieu en grec: ils suggérent que les Eglises devraient lire une Bible unifiée dans la même langue, Ancien et Nouveau Testaments en grec.[53]

«La Bible d'Alexandrie» souhaite donner une traduction de la Septante respectueuse de la pensée qu'ont voulu transmettre les Juifs à un moment de leur histoire. L'annotation présente de plus aux théologiens quelques traditions anciennes d'exégèse. Abordée dans la recherche universitaire sans présupposé confessionnel, sans croyance en un texte «divinement inspiré» ayant «autorité», la Septante enrichit la connaissance de la langue et de la littérature grecques et fait connaître la Bible comme un texte vivant, accompagné de lectures tout à tour authentifiées par les communautés croyantes qui ont reçu le texte, accumulation et mémoire de plusieurs expériences humaines.

NOTES

[1] Instituts de Göttingen et de Madrid; Universités d'Helsinki, d'Uppsala, de Leyde, de Louvain, du Canada, d'Australie; plusieurs Universités d'Israël et des USA, notamment l'Université Notre-Dame, responsable de l'IOSCS, de son bulletin et de la collection *Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. Pour une vue d'ensemble des travaux sur la Septante, on dispose de l'article très complet de P.-M. Bogaert, «Les études sur la Septante. Bilan et perspectives» (*Revue Théologique de Louvain*, 16, 1985, 174-200); voir aussi E. Tov, «The Septuagint», *Mikra. Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. M.J. Mulder, H. Sysling, Assen, Maastricht 1988, p. 161-188, et notre manuel (G. Dorival, M. Harl, O. Munnich, *La Bible grecque des Septante. Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien*, Paris 1988). De P.-M. Bogaert paraîtra un grand article *Septante*, dans le *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*. Les références bibliographiques que l'on trouvera dans les notes suivantes, sur quelques sujets, sans exhaustivité, ont seulement pour objet d'indiquer comment nous nous situons par rapport aux publications récentes de nos collègues septantistes.

[2] Le projet a été présenté dans la revue *Lalies*, «Traduire la Septante en français: pourquoi et comment?» (repris avec d'autres articles dans M. Harl, *La langue de Japhet. Quinze*

études sur la Septante et le grec des chrétiens, Paris, Cerf, 1992). Dans la collection *La Bible d'Alexandrie,* aux Editions du Cerf, sous la direction de M. Harl, sont parus les volumes 1 (1986, *La Genèse,* par M. Harl), 2 (1989, *L'Exode,* par A. Le Boulluec et P. Sandevoir), 3 (1988, *Le Lévitique*, par P. Harlé et D. Pralon) et 5 (1992, *Le Deutéronome*, par C. Dogniez et M. Harl); le volume 4, *Les Nombres*, par G. Dorival, paraîtra en 1994.

[3] H.-I. Marrou avait mis en valeur la culture des périodes hellénistique et romaine dans sa thèse sur Saint Augustin (1938) et dans son *Histoire de l'Education dans l'Antiquité* (1948). L'essai d'A. Momigliano (*Sagesses barbares. Les limites de l'hellénisation,* Cambridge 1976) connut un grand succès en France ainsi que l'ouvrage de Martin Hengel (traduction anglaise *Judaism and Hellenism*, Londres 1974). S'intéressaient particulièrement à l'histoire ancienne du judaïsme V. Nikiprowetzky, P. Vidal-Naquet, J. Mélèze Modrzejwski (outre ses articles de papyrologie, voir son ouvrage récent *Les Juifs d'Egypte*, Paris 1991), E. Will et C. Orrieux (par ex. *Ioudaïsmos-Hellènismos*, Nancy 1985). La revue *Recherches de Science Religieuse* publie régulièrement un Bulletin bibliographique sur le judaïsme ancien, rédigé par André Paul.

[4] Pierre Chantraine publiait en fascicules son *Dictionnaire Etymologique de la Langue Grecque. Histoire des mots,* à partir de 1968 (terminé pas ses élèves en 1980).

[5] Sur ces questions, voir des précisions dans l'avant-propos de mon recueil récent *Le déchiffrement du sens. Etudes sur l'herméneutique chrétienne d'Origène à Grégoire de Nysse*, Paris, Institut des Etudes Augustiniennes, 1993. Les traductions successives de la Bible en français, pour cette époque, sont: la Bible dite «de Jérusalem» (par fascicules, de 1948 à 1954); la Bible éditée sous la direction d'E. Dhorme dans la collection «La Pleiade» (1956-1959); la Bible d'E. Osty et J. Trinquet (1973); la Bible traduite par A. Chouraqui (1974); la Traduction Oecuménique de la Bible (1975).

[6] Deux publications, entre beaucoup d'autres, furent pour nous importantes. R. Le Déaut procura entre 1978 et 1980 la traduction des deux recensions palestiniennes du Targum du Pentateuque. Le tome III, 1 de l'édition nouvelle d'E. Schürer, révisée par G. Vermès, F. Millar et M. Goodman, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (175 B.C.-A.D. 135) parut à Edinburg en 1986 (La Septante y est à juste titre traitée au milieu des autres œuvres juives de cette époque écrites en grec).

[7] Pour le lancement de l'entreprise et sa publication aux Editions du Cerf, le rôle de D. Barthélemy fut déterminant. Nous l'avions rencontré à propos de Philon d'Alexandrie, en 1966, au moment où ses études sur la Septante étaient en plein essor (voir ses *Etudes d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament*, réunissant ses articles en 1978, *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* 21, Fribourg Suisse-Göttingen). Un bibliste vint se joindre à notre groupe dès le début, P. Sandevoir. P.-M. Bogart fut aussi l'un de nos premiers conseillers.

[8] A la différence de E.A. Nida (*Towards a Science of Translating*, Leiden 1964), qui prône une traduction de la Bible hébraïque en «équivalence dynamique» faite pour atteindre les destinataires et en recevoir une réponse, H. Meschonnic a plaidé en faveur d'une «poétique de la traduction» qui rende «le rythme» du texte. Ce linguiste a publié plusieurs essais parus à Paris aux Editions Gallimard dans les années 1970-1980, accompagnés d'une très belle traduction des Cinq Rouleaux. Dans un article paru dans la Nouvelle Revue Française en mars 1980 («Il n'y a pas de judéo-chrétien»), H. Meschonnic pousse à l'extrême sa thèse: non seulement la Bible, c'est uniquement le texte hébreu, mais de plus tout ce qui est écrit en grec, c'est...du chrétien! Je dirai plus loin ma réserve: la langue grecque ne véhicule pas nécessairement les idées «grecques» de l'hellénisme, ni les idées «chrétiennes» du Nouveau Testament.

[9] La syntaxe de la Septante est particulièrement étudiée par les philologues d'Helsinki: I. Soisalon-Soininen, A. Aejmealaeus, R. Solamo.

[10] Voir cependant d'excellentes études sur les phénomènes de traduction dans la Septante (par exemple, E. Bickerman, «The Septuagint as a Translation», *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 28, 1959, repris dans *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*, Leyde 1976, I, p. 167-200, et C. Rabin, «The Translation Process and the character of the Septuagint», *Textus* 6, 1968, p. 1-26) et les articles brefs mais remarquables de S.P. Brock: «The phenomenon of the Septuagint», *Oudtestamentische Studien* 17, 1972, p. 11-36; «The phenomenon of biblical translation in Antiquity», repr. in S. Jellicoe (ed), *Studies in the Septuagint*, New York 1974, p. 541-571; «Aspects of translation technique in Antiquity», *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 20, 1979, p. 69-87; «The Septuagint», *Sourozh* 29, 1987, p. 32-44; «Translating the Old Testament», *Essays in Honour of B. Lindars* (ed. D. Carson, H. Williamson), Cambridge 1988, p. 87-98.

[11] «Le style du Lévitique des Septante. Un grec de traduction et ses effets dans la langue grecque», *La Bible d'Alexandrie* 3 (P. Harlé et D. Pralon), p. 47-81.

[12] Introduction au *Deutéronome*, p. 30-33, *La Bible d'Alexandrie 5* (littéralisme et grécité).

[13] Autres exemples de ce que nous renonçons à traduire par décalque dans l'Introduction à *La Genèse* p. 75-79, *La Bible d'Alexandrie* 1.

[14] Sur les conditions créées par le bilinguisme (ou le trilinguisme) et les effets d'interférences, voir G.H.R. Horsley, *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, vol. 5, *Linguistic Essays*, Macquarie University, 1989, avec une importante bibliographie.

[15] En 1979, P. Deseille a publié une traduction française du Psautier des Septante à l'usage des chrétiens orthodoxes (YMCA-Press).

[16] Voir dans l'Introduction à la *Genèse*, p. 81-82 (*La Bible d'Alexandrie* 1) un texte d'A. Jarriges sur le parallélisme et la «disposition poétique» des phrases. Sur le parallélisme dans la Septante, voir S. Segert, «Hebrew Poetic Parallelism as Reflected in the Septuagint», *La Septuaginta en la Investigación Contemporanea* (V Congreso de la IOSCS). Textos y Estudios «Cardenal Cisneros» 34, N. Fernández Marcos (ed.), Madrid 1985, p. 133-148. Pour la traduction des textes poétiques, un essai a été donné pour *Job* par J.G. Gammie: le traducteur de Job a une grande maîtrise poétique: assonances, renforcement du parallélisme, usage de particules et de certains mots grecs... («The Septuagint of Job: its Poetic Style and Relationship to the Septuagint of Proverbs», *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 49, 1987, p. 14-31).

[17] Autres exemples dans l'Introduction à la *Genèse*, p. 75-76.

[18] Ce domaine de recherche est en pleine extension. Voir N. Fernández Marcos, «La Septuaginta y los hallazgos des desierto de Judá. *Simposio Bíblico Español, Salamanca 1982*. N. Fernández Marcos, J.C. Trebolle Barrera, J. Fernández Vallina (ed.), Madrid 1984, p. 229-245. — E. Tov, «Determining the Relationship between the Qumran Scrolls and the LXX: Some Methodological Issues», *The Hebrew and Greek Text of Samuel*, 1980 Proceedings IOSCS, Vienna, E. Tov (éd.), Jerusalem 1980, p. 45-67. — d'E. Tov plusieurs autres articles (*Textus* 1986; *Journal of Jewish Studies* 1988) notamment «The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Understanding of the LXX» dans le volume *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings. Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings (Manchester 1990)*, G.J. Brooke, B. Lindars (ed.), *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 33, Atlanta, Georgia, 1992, p. 11-47.

[19] S.P. Brock a plusieurs fois insisté sur l'importance des textes bibliques «réels», «vivants», et a montré qu'Origène, par exemple, en constituant les Hexaples, avait pour objet principal d'établir un *textus receptus* acceptable pour le dialogue entre les juifs et les chrétiens: «Origen's aims as a Textual Critic of the Old Testament», 1964, repris dans S. Jellicoe (ed.), *Studies in the Septuagint*, 1974, p. 343-346. Lorsque je parlai à S.P. Brock de mon projet d'une traduction de la Septante, il me demanda s'il ne serait pas bon de traduire le texte antiochien pour certains livres. Ce texte, pour les livres de *Samuel* et des *Rois*, est maintenant publié par N. Fernández Marcos et J.R. Busto Saiz (Madrid 1989 et 1992).

[20] J.W. Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Deuteronomy*, Göttingen 1978. Le papyrus Fouad Inv. 266 montre en 15 cas que le texte ancien de la Septante était plus court que le texte des grands manuscrits. G. Dorival, pour les *Nombres*, soulignera plus que nous ne l'avons fait l'apport de l'édition de Wevers. — En quelques rares cas, le texte reconnu comme le plus ancien est un texte conjecturé, reconstitué pour des raisons paléographiques sans le soutien de la tradition manuscrite ni des citations anciennes: par exemple, l'éditeur d'Isaïe, ayant constaté une divergence surprenante entre le grec et l'hébreu, probablement due à une faute de copie du texte grec, conjecture ce qui avait *peut-être* été le texte premier; en *Isaïe* 26,18 le grec ne donne pas la négation de l'hébreu (tous les manuscrits connus et toutes les citations patristiques (plusieurs dizaines) font dire aux prophètes: «l'esprit de ton salut, *nous l'avons créé* sur la terre»); mais peut-être la donnait-il (le pronom σου, serait une erreur pour οὐ par dittographie du sigma final du mot précédent)? J. Ziegler restitue une négation qui était *peut-être* dans la Septante primitive, comme en hébreu: «*nous ne l'avons pas créé*». Traduirons-nous le texte conjecturé, ou le texte de la tradition (qui est une tradition chrétienne)?

[21] T. Muraoka, «A Septuagint Greek grammar, but of which text-form or -forms?», Conférence donnée à l'Ecole Normale Supérieure de Paris, mai 1993.

[22] Autres exemples du vieillissement du grec des Septante dans ma contribution au colloque de l'IOSCS à Louvain en 1989, «Le renouvellement du lexique des Septante d'après le témoignage des recensions, révisions et commentaires grecs anciens», repris dans *La langue de Japhet*, p. 145-165.

[23] Un bon exemple de ce procédé est donné en *Deutéronome* 7,13 pour trois mots qui nomment le blé, le vin et l'huile: voir A. Paul, «Sur les traductions de la Bible», *Esprit*, 1982, p. 79-86. Quelques remarques sur l'usage des Hexaples dans ma communication «La Septante et la pluralité textuelle des Ecritures. Le témoignage des Pères Grecs», *Naissance de la méthode critique*, Colloque du centenaire de l'Ecole biblique et archéologique française de Jérusalem, Paris 1992, p. 231-243. Sur le projet d'une nouvelle édition des Hexaples, voir G.J. Norton, «Cautionary Reflections on a Re-edition of fragments of Hexaplaric Material», *Tradition of the text, Studies offered to D. Barthélemy*, ed. J. Norton, S. Pisano, Freiburg Schweiz-Göttingen 1991, p. 129-155.

[24] Voir les critiques portées contre l'ouvrage de N. Turner, *Christian Words*, Edinbourg 1980, entre autres par G.H.R. Horsley (note 26).

[25] *Septuagintal Lexicography*, ed. R.A. Kraft, *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 1, Revised Edition 1975 (études de R.A. Kraft; reprises d'études de L. Margolis et d'H.S. Gehman; interventions de S.P. Brock et de J.A.L. Lee). Voir encore *Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography*, éd. T. Muraoka, 1990 (articles de J.A.L. Lee, T. Muraoka, S.P. Swinn; E. Tov, «Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings»). — *A Greek-English lexicon of the Septuagint*, Part I, A-I, Stuttgart 1992 (J. Lust, E. Eynikel, K. Hauspie). T.

Muraoka vint de publier *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint (The Twelve Prophets)*, Leuven 1993.

[26] G.H.R. Horsley, «Divergent Views on the Nature of the Greek of the Bible», *Biblica* 1984, p. 393-403, critique à l'égard de l'ouvrage de N. Turner (c'est une erreur de faire une distinction entre le grec profane et le grec religieux, chrétien; de croire que les emplois nouveaux viennent de ce que les auteurs sont chrétiens); approbation des positions de J.A.L. Lee, *A lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch*, Chico 1983.

[27] Cet alignement des deux textes a été informatisé à l'Université hébraïque de Jérusalem sous la direction de E. Tov (Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies = CATSS). Nul septantiste ne refuse de voir dans le grec des Septante des hébraïsmes, qu'a particulièrement étudiés H.S. Gehman. Voir *La Bible grecque des Septante* p. 248-251.

[28] Horsley, «Divergent Views...», p. 397 avec une citation de J.A.L. Lee. Les papyrologues italiens se rattachent à l'enseignement d'O. Montevecchi, à Milan (voir son article «Continuità ed evoluzione della lingua greca nella Settanta e nei papiri», *Actes du Xe Congrès International de Papyrologie*, Varsovie 1964).

[29] E. Tov a insisté sur la polysémie des mots de traduction («Three dimensions of LXX words», *Revue Biblique* 1976, p. 529-544) et sur les traductions stéréotypées. Pour lui, un lexique de la Septante doit donner la priorité au sens qui correspond à «l'intention du traducteur», très proche du sens de l'hébreu, les autres sens étant secondaires.

[30] E. Tov, «The impact of the LXX translation of the Pentateuch on the translation of the other books», *Mélanges D. Barthélemy*, éd. P. Casetti, O. Keel et A. Schenker, Fribourg Suisse-Göttingen 1981, p. 577-592.

[31] Le traducteur alexandrin fait lui-même de l'exégèse analogique lorsqu'il emprunte un mot de traduction à un autre livre pour rapprocher les deux contextes (par exemple le Psaume 28,6 reprend le verbe λεπτύνειν d'Exode 32,20 qui rappelle l'épisode du veau d'or; en *Proverbes* 3, 18 l'emploi de ξύλον (ζωῆς), à la place de δένδρον, renvoie à l'arbre de vie de *Genèse* 2,9). Voir J. Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique du judaïsme antique d'après les témoins textuels d'Isaïe*, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 33, Leiden 1982. Ce rapprochement est exploité par des exégètes anciens, comme Philon ou Origène, qui pratiquent parfois délibérément une lecture de la Bible fondée précisément sur les mots.

[32] Andrei Cornea (Bucarest), «A Question of Translation. The Greek for «Covenant» in the Septuagint», *Annal of the «Sergiu Al-George» Institute*, vol. 1, Bucarest 1992, p. 35-43. On sait d'ailleurs que l'hébreu dit «couper une alliance» et qu'en grec pareillement on dit «couper (des victimes) pour assurer un serment» (J. Casabona, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire des sacrifices en grec*, Aix-en-Provence 1967, 211-230).

[33] Les spécialistes de l'histoire du texte biblique, comme D. Barthélemy, en arrivent à respecter l'autonomie des deux traditions, sans contaminer l'une par l'autre: voir par exemple l'Introduction à la *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, Fribourg Suisse-Göttingen 1982, tome 1, p. 111: «les grandes «éditions» traditionnelles de l'Ancien Testament méritent d'abord d'être respectées comme des témoins authentiques, du fait qu'elles ont représenté et continuent à représenter l'Ecriture Sainte pour telle ou telle branche du peuple de Dieu». Voir aussi S.P. Brock, «To revise or not to revise: attitudes to Jewish biblical translations», G.J. Brooke, B. Lindars, *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings* cité en note 18), p. 301-338.

[34] Le volume de l'*Exode (La Bible d'Alexandrie* 2) a utilisé exceptionnellement le procédé typographique des caractères italiques pour indiquer dans la traduction les divergences entre la Septante et l'hébreu (sur le modèle de ce qu'a fait R. Le Déaut pour les Tar-

gums), mais cela ne dispense pas d'expliquer les divergences et l'on ne peut pas signaler absolument tous les petits détails différents. Le volume des *Nombres* fera une grande place aux divergences.

[35] J.W. Wevers, «Translation and Canonicity. A Study in the Narrative Portions of the Greek Exodus», *Scripta Signa Vocis* in h.J.H. Hospers, Groningen 1986, p. 295-303, et dans le Bulletin de l'IOSCS de 1985, «An Apology for Septuagint Studies», p. 16-38. Voir aussi R. Le Déaut, «La Septante, un Targum?», *Etudes sur le Judaïsme hellénistique*, Lectio divina 119, Paris 1984, p. 147-195.

[36] Travaillant un jour sur un verset de Job (34,21), O. Munnich notait six différences: un pronom personnel de plus en grec, un adverbe au lieu d'une conjonction, le nom «spectateur» au lieu des «yeux», les «actes» au lieu des «chemins», un pluriel au lieu d'un singulier, «ce qu'ils font» au lieu de «leurs pas»; il remarquait toutefois l'absence de portée théologique, et concluait qu'ici comme souvent ailleurs les différences entre le grec et l'hébreu sont matière de style, par exemple pour ce verset une tendance à l'abstraction.

[37] Le travail du «Comité pour l'analyse textuelle de l'Ancien Testament hébreu», dont D. Barthélemy publie les résultats, était de «prendre position sur les 5.000 difficultés principales que le Texte Massorétique posait à ses traducteurs récents» (*Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, 1, Fribourg Suisse-Göttingen, p. *66). Sur l'usage de la Septante, voir E. Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, Jérusalem 1981, et les remarques méthodologiques de J.W. Wevers, «The Use of Versions for Text Criticism: the Septuagint», *La Septuaginta en la Investigación contemporanea* (cité dans la note 16), p. 15-24.

[38] Les études de I.L. Seeligman. (*The LXX version of Isaiah*, Leiden 1948) et de J. Coste («Le texte grec d'Isaïe XXV, 1-5», *Revue Biblique* 61, 1954, p. 36-66) restent des modèles. Plus récemment: J. Carreira Marcelino Das Neves, *A Teologia da Traduçao Grega dos Setenta no livro de Isaías* (cap. 24 de Isaías), Coïmbra 1973 et A. Van Der Kooij, «Die Septuaginta Jesajas als Dokument jüdischer Exegese. Einige Notizen zu LXX-Jes 7», *Übersetzung und Deutung. Studien zu dem Alten Testament und seiner Umwelt*. A.R. Hulst (ed.), Nijkerk 1977, p. 91-102.

[39] Rappelons L. Prijs, *Jüdisch Tradition in der Septuaginta*, Leyde 1948; voir aussi, entre autres études de G. Vermès, «Bible and Midrash: Early Old Testament Exegesis», *The Cambridge History of the Bible* I, Cambridge 1970, p. 199-231 et des articles de D.W. Gooding (par exemple «On the Use of the LXX for Dating Midrashic Elements in the Targums», *Journal of Theological Studies* 25, 1, 1974, p. 1-11).

[40] *La Bible grecque des Septante*, p. 289-320 («La Septante chez les Pères Grecs»).

[41] J'ai regretté que le *Patristic Greek Lexicon* de G.W.H. Lampe n'ait pas signalé l'origine septantique de mots utilisés par les chrétiens pour des réalités ou des idées particulièrement importantes dans les Eglises anciennes (article paru dans le *Journal of Theological Studies* de 1963, repris dans *La langue de Japhet* cité en n. 2; voir p. 181).

[42] R. Hanhart «Die Bedeutung der Septuaginta für die Definition des « «hellenistischen Judentums» ». *Congress Volume. Jerusalem 1986*. J.A. Emerton (ed.) *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* 40, Leiden, 1988, p. 67-80. L'auteur montre que les trois caractères principaux de la traduction grecque, — préservation, actualisation, interprétation —, correspondant à l'intention des traducteurs de donner le sens «canonique» de l'original, procurant à la communauté croyante une légitimation culturelle et politique vis-à-vis des puissants de l'époque.

[43] Toutefois la raison du rejet de la Septante par les Juifs n'est probablement pas l'usage

de la langue grecque, — qui continue à être appréciée des rabbins —, mais l'appropriation de cette forme de la Bible par les chrétiens.

[44] Quelques exemples dans *La langue de Japhet*.

[45] Bon nombre des spécialistes de Philon insistent actuellement sur son enracinement dans les traditions juives. La bibliographie est immense. Voir R. Radice, D.T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria. An Annoted Bibliography 1937-1986, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae* 8, Leiden 1988.

[46] E. Nodet, Flavius Josèphe, *Les Antiquités Juives* vol. I, livres I à III, Paris 1990, Introduction p. XXVII-XXIX, et ma communication au congrès de l'IOSCS de Paris, 1992, «L'originalité lexicale de la version grecque du *Deutéronome* et la «paraphrase» de Josèphe (AJ IV, 176-331)» (à paraître dans les Actes).

[47] P.-M. Bogaert «La Septante, passage obligé entre l'exégèse biblique et les autres disciplines de la théologie», *Revue de l'Institut catholique de Paris*, 29, 1989, p. 63-78.

[48] Quelques études récentes sur les rapport textuels ou théologiques entre le Nouveau Testament et la Septante: N. Fernández Marcos, «La Biblia de los autores del Nuevo Testamento», *II Simposio Bíblico Español* (Córdoba, 1985), V. Collardo-Bertomeu, V. Vilar-Hueso (éd.), Valencia-Córdoba, 1987, p. 171-181. — R. Hanhart, «Die Bedeutung der Septuaginta in neutestamentlicher Zeit», *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 81, 1984, p. 395-416. — B. Lindars, «The Place of the Old Testament in the Formation of New Testament Theology», *New Testament Studies* 23, 1977, p. 59-66 (suivi de P. Borgen, «Response. Concerning the Jewish Sources». p. 67-75).

[49] Voir *La Bible grecque des Septante*, p. 256-257.

[50] Voir *La Bible grecque des Septante*, p. 216-222. Quelques exemples donnés par E. Tov, «Theological motivated exegesis embedded in the Septuagint», *Translation of Scripture, A Jewish Quarterly Review Supplement* 1990, p. 215-233. Certaines modifications «théologiques», également présentes dans les textes de Qumran, appartenaient déjà au modèle hébreu de la Septante, comme l'a montré A. Rofé sur un exemple («Qumranic paraphrases, the Greek Deuteronomy and the late history of the biblical *nashi*», *Textus* 14, 1988, p. 163-174).

[51] D. Barthélemy, «L'Ancien Testament a mûri à Alexandrie», *Theologische Zeitschrift 21, 1965* (repris dans *Etudes...*, p. 127-139).

[52] L'expression d'Eusèbe de Césarée fut reprise par G. Bertram: «Praeparatio Evangelica in der Septuaginta», *Vetus Testamentum* 1957, p. 225-249.

[53] M. Müller, «Hebraica sive graeca veritas? The Jewish Bible at the Time of the New Testament and the Christian Bible», *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament, 1989*, 2, p. 55-71.

75006 *Paris*, 121bis rue Notre-Dame des Champs

Vigiliae Christianae 47 (1993), 341-362, © E. J. Brill, Leiden

ATHANASIUS OF ALEXANDRIA: THE SCOPE OF SCRIPTURE IN POLEMICAL AND PASTORAL CONTEXT

BY

JAMES D. ERNEST*

Athanasius of Alexandria is best known as the resolute controversialist who championed the Nicene *homoousios* against Arian and "semi-Arian" objections. In this struggle he demonstrated his rhetorical acumen by marshalling arguments of all known varieties, plus rarer types of his own devising.[1] Even his *Life of Antony*, which is on the face of it a primer in ascetic spirituality, functions in the anti-Arian polemic by asserting the revered monk's example of subordination to clergy and his loathing of Arian heretics.[2] Primarily, however, Athanasius's dispute with the Arians took the form of a battle over the interpretation of the Bible. To a degree, this was inevitable, since Arians and pro-Nicenes alike were committed to demonstrating that their doctrines were found in Scripture. Hence the talk of Athanasius's anti-Arian exegesis,[3] the implication being that his way of using Scripture is shaped specifically by the need to rebut the Arian prooftexts.

And yet not all of the authentic surviving writings of Athanasius present themselves as part of the anti-Arian polemics. This is the case with the two well-known works from the earliest part of Athanasius's career, the *Contra Gentes* and the *De Incarnatione*.[4] It is also the case with a work probably written closer to the end of the bishop's career[5] and not very similar in character either to this early pair of writings or to the anti-Arian works: the *Letter to Marcellinus on the Interpretation of the Psalms*. So this paper will examine one aspect of the biblical hermeneutic of the anti-Arian writings, represented in this paper by the three *Orations Against the Arians*,[6] the *De Decretis*, and the *Second Letter to Serapion*, and then briefly suggest an understanding of the findings there in the context of Athanasius's broader concerns, as these are revealed in the *De Incarnatione* and the *Letter to Marcellinus*.[7]

A theme that has received prominent attention in recent assessments

of Athanasius's exegetical practice is the "scope of Scripture."[8] The fullest texts on this topic occur in *CA* 3; but since there is now some question regarding the authenticity of that treatise it seems better to begin with other texts and only afterward compare these with *CA* 3.[9] We will see that σκοπός is ony one of several interchangeable terms that Athanasius has for describing the theological—or better, Christological and soteriological—unity of Scripture.

We may begin with a text near the beginning of *De Incarnatione*:

> Perhaps you are wondering why, when we have set out to discuss the incarnation of the Word, we are now narrating concerning the beginning of humans. But this also is not foreign to the *scope* of the narration. For it is necessary for us, in speaking about the appearing of the Savior, to speak also concerning the beginning of humans, so that you may know that the charge against us was the reason for his descent, and that our transgression called forth the mercy (φιλανθρωπία) of the Word, so that the Lord both came to us and appeared among humans. For we constituted the basis for his incarnation, and it was for the sake of our salvation that he had mercy and came in human form and appeared in a body.[10]

The scope here is not explicitly the scope of Scripture but the scope of Athanasius's own narration. On the other hand, it is clear enough that it is Athanasius's intent to talk about what Scripture talks about. (We may think of the tendency of thirteenth-century theologians to treat the question of the subject of Lombard's *Sentences* or of their own *summae* interchangeably with the questions of the subject of Scripture and the subject of theology.) If Athanasius accounts for his attention to the first human disobedience in this treatise on the incarnation by indicating that the point of the incarnation was to restore to humankind what was lost thereby, then it will not be surprising later on to find him insisting that the scope *of Scripture* is the incarnation of the Word for the sake of human salvation.

For an instance of the actual phrase "scope of Scripture" apart from *CA* 3, we have to skip forward chronologically to the *Second Letter to Serapion*, written as an abbreviated guide to the refutation of "those who say that the son is a κτίσμα."[11] In the first several chapters of this work, Athanasius reviews the prooftexts for the deity of the Son and demonstrates both the incompatibility of these with the assertion that he is created and also the necessity of the assertion that he is *homoousios* with the Father. After this, he takes up a leading Arian text, Prov 8:22:

> They use what is written in the book of Proverbs—"The Lord created me as a beginning of his ways for his works"—as a pretext for stating, "See, 'he created'; he is a created being." For this reason it is necessary to demonstrate how far they go astray through not knowing the scope of divine Scripture. For if he is a son, let it not be said that he is a created being, and if he is a creature, let him not be called a son; for I have demonstrated above what a vast difference there is between a created being and a son. Furthermore, baptism is not validated by the words "into the Creator and the Created," but "into the Father and the Son," so the Lord must not be called "created being" but Son. "Is it not in Scripture?" they say. Of course it is in Scripture, and it has to be stated! But the heretics have a bad understanding of a good statement. For if they knew and understood the character of Christianity, they would not have called the Lord of glory a created being, nor would they have tripped over what is written well.[12]

Athanasius adapts 1 Cor 2:8 (in which Paul says of the "rulers of this age" that "if they had known [God's hidden wisdom], they would not have crucified the Lord of glory") as a comment on the failure of the heretics to understand Scripture and their consequent dishonoring of Christ by their failure to recognize his full deity. This same connection between the Arians, the misunderstanding of Prov 8:22, and 1 Cor 2:8 appears at *DD* 13 (where what the heretics miss is this verse's διάνοιαν εὐσεβῆ καὶ λίαν ὀρθήν, PG 25.445 B 12-13), *CA* 1.53 (substituting their own poison ἀντὶ ... τῆς ἀληθινῆς διανοίας, PG 26.121 C 10-11),[13] and (to take a parallel from the contested third discourse) *CA* 3.1 (where they miss τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας διάνοιαν, PG 26.324 B 2-3).[14]

Shortly after the above-cited passage from *Ep. Serap.*, Athanasius goes on to explain what he means by τὸν χαρακτῆρα τοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ:

> Now the character of the faith that is in Christ is this: The Son of God, being God the Word (for "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was God"), being the Wisdom and Power of the Father (for [Scripture calls him] "Christ the power of God and wisdom of God")—this one, at the completion of the ages, became a human being for the sake of our salvation.... And having become human and set human affairs in order, and having routed and abolished the death penalty that we had incurred, he is now seated at the right hand of the Father. He is in the Father, and the Father is in him, as was always the case and will be forever. This is the character [of the Christian faith] as we have it from the apostles through the fathers.[15]

This amounts to a summary narration of the career of the Word from pre-incarnate existence with the Father as God the Word, through his incarnation and incarnate work, to his present and eternal coexistence

with the Father. Athanasius seems to believe that this "character" or distinctive mark of Christianity is in a dialectical way both the result and the criterion of the correct interpretation of Scripture. It derives from the apostles (which would mean at least the New Testament and probably also the unwritten catechesis of the apostles) and is mediated to Athanasius's own generation through the fathers of the church. It is presumably synonymous with what he calls the σκοπὸς τῆς θείας Γραφῆς near the beginning of the first *Ep. Serap.* 2.7 passage cited above (PG 26.620 A 6): the scope of Scripture in texts like Prov 8:22 is the whole account summarized by Athanasius as the "character" of the Christian faith.

What precisely does Athanasius mean by "scope"?[16] Müller gives the literal meaning (in the passive sense, which is what is of interest here) as "id, ad quod quis prospicit" and notes that the word is used especially in a stadium for the goal of a racer.[17] (There is a good example of this in *Contra Gentes.*)[18] The broader, metaphorical sense is given by Müller as "id, quod quis docendo, scribendo, credendo intendit."[19] I cannot see why Pollard rejects this definition[20] in favor of "general drift." Hanson apparently sees no big distinction here: "And the pro-Nicenes are quite often ready to appeal behind the words of Scripture to their intention or drift (*skopos*)."[21] If there is a difference, it is that "general drift" suggests something vague, whereas there is nothing vague about Athanasius's insistence on understanding Scripture texts about Christ in terms of the incarnate and pre-incarnate existence of the Word.

On occasion the issue is put in terms of a distinction between private notions of the interpreter and what we would call "authorial intent." Thus in the *Letter to Serapion Concerning the Death of Arius,* Athanasius forbids the copying of his letter because of the danger that those into whose hands the copies might fall would distort its meaning:

> For most people do not look to fidelity, or to the writer's intent, but on account of either envy or spite they take [what is written] in whatever way they themselves please, in accord with the understanding of their own prejudiced opinion, and transform the things written according to their private pleasure.[22]

Interpretation—now not of some other writings but of the Scriptures—in accord with their own private understanding (τὸν ἴδιον νοῦν)[23] is precisely the charge Athanasius lays against the Arians. Here also authorial intent may be invoked in behalf of the orthodox

Christological meaning of a text. At the end of *CA* 2, where the Arian misinterpretation of Prov 8:22 is contrasted with Solomon's understanding:

> Vain then is your vaunt as is on all sides shewn, O Christ's enemies, and vainly did ye parade and circulate everywhere your text, 'The lord created me a beginning of His ways,' perverting its sense, and publishing, not Solomon's meaning, but your own comment (καὶ μᾶλλον τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἐπίνοιαν, ἢ τὸν νοῦν τοῦ Σολομῶνος, ἀπαγγέλλοντες). For behold your sense (τὸ ὑμῶν φρόνημα) is proved to be but a fantasy....[24]

Of course, this is not a modern notion of authorial intent; moderns would hold that the author of the Proverbs could not conceivably have had a clue about either orthodox or heterodox Christology. But Athanasius is not encumbered by any such consideration.

In a couple of other places where Athanasius uses the word σκοπός, however, he is not talking about the intent of Scripture but the intent of ecclesiastical writers or an orthodox bishop. Thus at *DS* 46, he says that one person, thinking of ἀγέννητος[25] as meaning "having no cause," might say that the Son is not ἀγέννητος; another, thinking of the fact that the Son is neither a ποίημα nor a κτίσμα, might say that he *is* ἀγέννητος. Each has spoken correctly, given his own intent (ἀμφότεροι γὰρ πρὸς τὸν ἴδιον σκοπὸν ὁρῶντες, καλῶς εἰρήκασιν). In the same way, the various Fathers have said different things about the ***homoousios***; we should not pick fights with them but receive their words reverently, especially since they were striving after reverence (εὐσέβεια). Another instance is in the *Letter to the Presbyter Palladius*. Like the letter to John and Antiochus which it follows in Migne and in the *NPNF*, the letter to Palladius urges a presbyter at Caesarea to accept the authority of Basil (the Great) rather than quibble over words—presumably his reluctance to call the Holy Spirit God.[26] It would be right to combat one who was "suspect concerning the truth" (ὕποπτος ... περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν), but since Athanasius is convinced that Basil is in fact contending *for* the truth, he is willing to assume that any irregularities in his language are due to a strategy of becoming weak in order to win the weak. The monks of Caesarea should fix their attention not on his questionable utterances but rather on τὸν σκοπὸν τῆς ἀληθείας αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν οἰκονομίαν—and thank God that they have such a bishop.[27] This is a bit difficult. What would Athanasius mean by "the scope of his [Basil's] truth"?[28] Perhaps it would make more sense to construe αὐτοῦ with σκοπόν and give the latter

an active meaning:[29] the monks should focus not on Basil's perhaps sometimes infelicitous language but on the fact that what he is aiming at is the truth (τὸν σκοπὸν τῆς ἀληθείας αὐτοῦ) and on the way in which he carries out his episcopal duties (καὶ τὴν οἰκονομίαν).[30] At any rate, both *DS* 46 and this latter text make the point that particular utterances should be taken in the context of a writer's overall εὐσέβεια (which goes along with orthodoxy) or lack thereof.

This is the same point that Athanasius makes regarding the words of Scripture.[31] A passage that illustrates this point—without using the word σκοπός—is *CA* 2.16. Here Athanasius has taken up the troublesome Arian prooftext in which Peter, in his Pentecost sermon, tells his hearers, "He [God] has made both Lord and Christ that same Jesus whom you have crucified" (*CA* 2.11, quoting Acts 2:36). This text, Athanasius says, is to be understood as speaking of Christ's humanity; and speaking of Christ's humanity means speaking in terms of the narrative of the economy of salvation. Thus Athanasius once again rehearses the story, from fall to incarnation (*CA* 2.14). Since he holds that it is a characteristically Jewish mistake to think of the Christ as merely human (*CA* 2.15), he next sets down his own paraphrase and amplification of Peter's Pentecost address to the people of Jerusalem. The prooftexts cited include one that is not used in the New Testament (Deut 28:66, "You shall see your life hanging before your eyes") and two that are in fact found in Peter's speech in Acts 2 (Ps 110:1, "The Lord said to my Lord, Sit at my right hand until I make your enemies your footstool"; and Ps. 16:10, "You will not leave my soul in Hades, neither will you let your Holy One see corruption"). After citing these, Peter-Athanasius comments:

> Now that such utterances do not look forward to David, he himself bears witness, calling the one to come his Lord; and you also see for yourselves that he died.... For David and all the prophets died, and the tombs of all of them are with us; but the resurrection that has now happened has shown that the things written look forward to this one [i.e., Jesus].[32]

This is the point in Acts at which Peter's remarks conclude with the verse that the Arians found so useful. The Athanasius speech, however, here makes the point that the signs that were fulfilled in him showed that the one who was in the body was God (δείκνυσι θεὸν εἶναι τὸν ἐν σώματι), not a mere human (ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος). Then Athanasius offers his amplified version of the contested verse:

Acts 2:36 (NA 26)	*CA* 2.16 (PG 26.181 A 3-7)
ἀσφαλῶς οὖν γινωσκέτω πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ ὅτι	ἀσφαλῶς γινωσκέτω πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ ὅτι οὗτος ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὃν ἐθεωρήσατε σχήματι ἄνθρωπον, ποιοῦντα σημεῖα καὶ τοιαῦτα ἔργα, ἃ μηδεὶς πώποτε πεποίηκεν, αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ Κύριος πάντων.
καὶ κύριον αὐτὸν καὶ χριστὸν ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός, τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὃν ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε.	

The troublesome ἐποίησεν is gone, and reminders of the signs of Christ's deity are added, but Athanasius does not think that he is changing what the Bible says. His point is that so long as the interpreter keeps in mind that the scope of the verse in question (as of every verse of Scripture that has Christological bearing) is the whole narrative of the incarnation of the Word for our salvation, the particular wording of the verse poses no problem. For a reader who has lost sight of that scope, however, a corrective along the lines of his rewriting may be needed to restore the right meaning.

In three of the passages noted above (p. 343) where Athanasius paraphrases 1 Cor 2:8, what he says the heretics miss is the right, true, or reverent διάνοια of a passage of Scripture. Even more common in Athanasius than the citation of the Corinthians passage are comments to the effect that a certain text that is misused by the Arians nevertheless *has* a correct, true, reverent, etc., διάνοια. Thus at *CA* 1.37 Athanasius speaks of vindicating the words of Scripture (ἐκδικῆσαι τὰ ῥητά) by showing that they have a correct meaning (ὀρθὴν ἔχοντα τὴν διάνοιαν, PG 26.88 C 1); at *CA* 1.44, the Scripture in question has a quite churchly meaning (τὴν διάνοιαν τοῦ ῥητοῦ καὶ μάλα ἐκκλησιαστικὴν οὖσαν, PG 26.101 C 1-2). At *CA* 2.1 the right understanding of Scripture converges with what is said elsewhere—as in the passages to be discussed below in *CA* 3—about the scope of Scripture:

> All such sayings [of Scripture] have the same force and the same meaning (διάνοια), which has a view to godliness, and they show the deity of the Word—even the things said about him in a human way, since he became also Son of Man.[33]

At *CA* 2.7, the sense of the Scripture text in question is correct (ἡ διάνοια

τῶν γεγραμμένων ἐστὶν ὀρθή, PG 26.160 B 13): at *CA* 2.15, such is the meaning (διάνοια) of the passage, and the words have a true and good reason (ἀληθῆ καὶ χρηστὴν ἔχει τὴν αἰτίαν, PG 26.177 B 1-2); at *CA* 2.44. even Prov 8:22 has a correct meaning (ὀρθὴν ἔχον καὶ αὐτὸ τὴν διάνοιαν, PG 26.240 C 9). Another place that concisely indicates that when Athanasius says a passage has a correct διάνοια he is referring to Christological orthodoxy is in *CA* 2.77:

> The foregoing, then, is a sufficient demonstration that the Word of God is not a κτίσμα, but that the meaning (διάνοιαν) of the passage is correct. And since when thoroughly investigated the passage has a meaning (νοῦν) that is in every way correct, it makes sense to go on to say what this meaning (νοῦν) is....[34]

A bit later, concerning another verse in the same context: "... this also has the same meaning (ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦτο τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει διάνοιαν, *CA* 2.82, PG 26.320 C 8). These citations from *CA* 1 and 2 suffice to illustrate the usage in question, though other instances could be pointed out, notably in *CA* 3.[35]

Müller says that διάνοια may have a subjective meaning ("cogitandi facultas" or "cogitandi actio") or an objective meaning ("vis et significatio vocum").[36] The instances noted above[37] partake more of the latter: the correct διάνοια is not so much the activity or the contribution of the interpreter but the understanding that is embedded in the text and embodied in the church—is in fact the same thing as its (or its author's) σκοπός.[38] (This is a polemical claim: the Arian interpreter's ἐπίνοια—or corrupt διάνοια—is his own contribution of something foreign to the text, which in itself is orthodox.) And yet this does not mean that the correct meaning is always obvious and ready to hand. A certain amount of work may be required to extract it. This point is made above in the citation from *CA* 2.77 in the words "when thoroughly investigated" (διερευνώμενον). Sieben points out that Athanasius shared with Origen the belief that the meaning of Scripture must be searched out.[39] Thus at *CA* 2.12: "One must not apply such expressions (e.g., ἐποίησε, πεποίηται) to his godhead but search out (ἐρευνᾶν) why and how these things stand written" (PG 26.172 A 3-5). This investigation cannot be simply a matter of following certain exegetical rules; as early as *DI* 57 Athanasius insists that a pure and holy life is a prerequisite for understanding the Bible correctly.[40] Holy living and correct understanding fit together as part of the project of becoming λογικός (= in harmony with the Λόγος) again. One whose διάνοια ("facultas cogitandi") is healthy

will find ("actio cogitandi") the correct διάνοια ("significatio vocum") in the Scriptures.

But even though simply following certain rules is not enough, Athanasius does suggest certain questions that will elucidate texts. Thus at *CA* 1.54, when he takes up a text from Hebrews:

> For it is written, "Having become so much better than the angels"; for it is necessary to examine (ἐξετάσαι) this text in the first place. And we must, as it is appropriate to do with all of divine Scripture and thus necessary here as well, take the text faithfully as the Apostle wrote it, according to the time (καιρός), the person (πρόσωπον), and the matter (πρᾶγμα) that he said, lest the reader in ignorance run afoul of these or some other such item and thereby end up outside of the true understanding (διάνοια).[41]

Examples of the use of these questions are supplied from Scripture: the Ethiopian eunuch asked who the subject was of the prophecy he was reading; the apostles asked concerning the time of Jesus' prophecy of the destruction of the temple; Hymenaeus and Alexander got the time wrong and thought the resurrection had already occurred; the Galatians got the time wrong and thought that circumcision was still important; the Jews missed the person and are still awaiting the Messiah. So we must ask about the time of the words τοσούτῳ κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων; and the answer is, the time of the incarnation (*CA* 1.55).

Similarly, at *CA* 2.7, where Athanasius is considering the ἐποίησε implied in the phrase πιστὸν ὄντα τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν in Heb 3:2, he says that the διάνοια of this text is correct because it indicates the πότε and the πρὸς τί (PG 26.160 C 2), also referred to as the καιρός and the χρεία (C 3-4). As in the previous example, Athanasius focuses on time: the text applies not to the time of creation but to the time of the incarnation. The Word, who is the Creator, later was made high priest and put on (as his vestments) a body that was γενητόν and ποιητόν; in this sense he is said to have been made (*CA* 2.8; PG 26.164 A 3-7). Athanasius says that this διάνοια, this καιρός, and this πρόσωπον are made clear by the apostle who wrote the words πιστὸν ὄντα τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν in the same context (that is, the same train of thought: μία γὰρ ἀκολουθία ἐστί, B 3-7).

Again at *DD* 14, regarding Prov 8:22:

> "So then, was this passage written for no reason (μάτην)?" For this again is what they hum, like a swarm of gnats. Of course it was not written for no reason!—but of necessity. And he is even said to be created—but when he became a human, for being created is proper to humans. This meaning (διάνοιαν) will be found lying quite nicely in the words by the reader who

> does not read like a dilettante but searches out (ἐρευνῶν) both the time (καιρόν) and the persons (πρόσωπα) and also the purpose (χρείαν) of the things written, and so discerns and understands the lections.[42]

The time for this text, he goes on to specify, is the time of the incarnation; the purpose was our salvation through his sacrificial death; and the person is the incarnate Savior. Here again it is emphasized that the orthodox meaning is embedded in the Scripture but not in such a way that it can be discerned with no effort. The reader must attend to time, person, and purpose. This last term (χρεία) appears in effect to be another synonym of σκοπός and διάνοια.[43]

Stead points out the similarity of the interpretive categories that Athanasius invokes in these passages to lists of *staseis* given by rhetoricians such as Theon, Aphthonius, and Hermogenes; he suggests that Athanasius may have learned his schema from one of Origen's commentaries or some other exegetical writing.[44] Sieben had already traced the time-person-occasion triad in Tertullian, Origen, and Hilary.[45] The schema may just have been part of the usual education in grammar. But whatever the source of his categories, Athanasius applies them in a very focused way: *time* is the time of the incarnation; *purpose* is our salvation; *person* (or character) is the incarnate Word.[46] What we have is not really a *formal* principle[47] or an authentic, versatile exegetical technique that might shed light on all kinds of Scripture texts, as the language of "searching out" or "investigating" would seem to imply. Rather, we have a superficial (for want of a less prejorative-sounding adjective) technologizing of the same simple point that we saw Athanasius making earlier in the places where he speaks of the σκοπός or the right διάνοια of Scripture; namely, that whatever Scripture says about Christ is meant to fit in with the history of the incarnation of the Word of God for the sake of human salvation. Apart from some astute remarks on the genre of the Proverbs (*CA* 2.44, 2.77) and some observations on the language and rhetoric of Scripture,[48] this is Athanasius's only real exegetical principle and his only hermeneutical rule. Interpretations of Scripture that are in accord with this principle (i.e., that convey this content) are correct, healthy, churchly, and reverent; interpretations that deny it by calling the Word a created thing are wrong, corrupt, private, and ungodly.

When we finally turn to those passages in *CA* 3 which normally serve as the prime data for Athanasius's idea of the scope of Scripture, we find nothing that has not already been noted elsewhere; but what was implicit elsewhere is here made explicit. Thus in *CA* 3.28-29:

> ... That of what they now allege from the Gospels they certainly give an unsound interpretation (σαθρὰν ... διάνοιαν), we may easily see, if we now consider the scope of that faith which we Christians hold, and using it as a rule (ὥσπερ κανόνι χρησάμενοι), apply ourselves, as the Apostle teaches, to the reading of inspired Scripture. For Christ's enemies, being ignorant of this [scope], have wandered from the way of truth, and have stumbled on a stone of stumbling, thinking (φρονοῦντες) otherwise than they should think.
>
> Now the scope and character (σκοπός ... καὶ χαρακτήρ) of Holy Scripture, as we have often said, is this,—it contains a double account of the Saviour; that He was ever God, and is the Son, being the Father's Word and Radiance and Wisdom; and that afterwards for us He took flesh of a Virgin, Mary Bearer of God, and was made man. And this [scope] is to be found throughout inspired Scripture, as the Lord Himself has said, 'Search (ἐραυνάω)[49] the Scriptures, for they are they which testify of Me.'"[50]

Some of this is familiar: The use of the adjective σαθρός has parallels in *CA* 2 (PG 26.185 A 6 and 209 A 1):[51] and the σαθρὰ ... διάνοια of the heathen is contrasted to the truth of ecclesiastical knowledge at *CG* 7 (PG 25.16 A 5-7); the images of wandering from the truth and stumbling on a stone of stumbling are familiar, as is this use of φρονέω.[52] On the other hand, the σκοπός is seen less as embedded in Scripture as the intention inherent in particular verses, and more as an abstract[53] and objectified principle that may be used as a tool to interpret the whole of Scripture.[54] It is now the property of "us Christians" as opposed to the χριστομάχοι.[55] It is the scope *of the Christian faith*. As such it can be summed up in a creedal statement[56] and used as a κανών (a word not elsewhere used by Athanasius in this connection)—a rule of faith.[57] Of course, this is what was being done also in the other writings looked at earlier in this paper; here the procedure is more explicitly described. It is also justified by means of a saying of Jesus.[58]

Again in *CA* 3.35, in a kind of résumé of the way in which the principle of the διπλὴ ἐπαγγελία helps us sort out the diverse elements of the gospel accounts of Jesus, Athanasius appeals to the σκοπὸς τῆς πίστεως. The Arians fall into the errors of the Jews or the Manicheans,

> but let us, since we have the scope of the faith, recognize that the things that they interpret wrongly have a correct meaning.[59]

Later the scope is described as the "ecclesiastical scope":

> If the Christ-fighters had also interpreted these passages [i.e., lowly sayings about Jesus] in this way and had recognized the ecclesiastical scope as an

> anchor of the faith, they would not have been shipwrecked concerning the faith....[60]

Such people count as enemies those who exhort them to reverence (εὐσέβεια) because their corrupt hearts produce only ungodliness (ἀσέβεια, PG 445 B 1-5). "The faith" in question, like the intent of the particular text of Scripture in *CA* 1,[61] is that which is believed by the church. In *CA* 1-2 the emphasis is on what lies embedded in Scripture, while in *CA* 3 the stress is on the faith of the church; but of course to Athanasius the two are (or ought to be) identical, so the difference, though real and discernible, is finally only a difference of nuances.[62]

How may Athanasius's idea of the scope of Scripture be stated in the context of his life's work as a whole? The fundamental continuity underlying both the anti-Arian polemic, in which the idea of the scope of Scripture is central, and also the *De Incarnatione*, the *Letter to Marcellinus*, and the *Life of Antony*, is in the unfailing focus on Christ as the Word of God incarnate for human salvation; and "Word" here is understood not in terms of speculative philosophy but only in terms of the biblical data concerning God's reason and speech.[63] What God reveals is not the divine nature; it is ἀσεβές to ask ποῦ, πῶς, ποταπός concerning the Father or the generation of the Son (*CA* 2.36, PG 26.224 A 11-12). What is revealed is the mystery of salvation as it is actually accomplished.[64] Since the agent of this salvation is God the Word, preexistent and then incarnate, and since the function of Scripture is to mediate the knowledge and experience of salvation, the subject of Scripture—that to which it points, its σκοπός, the meaning (διάνοια) embedded in its narrative—is the incarnate Word. Since the locus of this salvation is the church, its proclamation is churchly, and by extension the very meaning of Scripture is churchly. Furthermore, since an understanding of this meaning inspires reverence, the manner in which it is discussed must be reverent—more precisely, reverent toward Christ. (Εὐσέβεια cannot be reduced without remainder to orthodoxy, though for Athanasius the two invariably go together.)

The operative understanding of salvation is that set forth in the *De Incarnatione*. When humans were created, they were given the gift of participation in the divine λόγος, but through sin they lost this participation and became ἄλογος (*DI* 3-5). Only the very Word of God could restore them to their former condition. This entailed putting on a body so as to be able to die and break the power of sin and death over humans

(*DI* 8-9; 25). In addition, the incarnation also allowed him to give humans a model for imitation, which is also part of the way in which they can again become λογικοί.

This provides a connection with the *Letter to Marcellinus*, which teaches that Christ is present in the Psalter in more ways than one. First of all, he is present there in precisely the way indicated for other texts of Scripture in the language about the scope of Scripture: the Psalter proclaims that the Lord will come, and that this coming one is God the Word and the Son of God (*Ep. Marc.* 5). It teaches that he will be born of a virgin (6), will be put to death (7), will ascend to God's right hand in heaven, and will return to judge the world (8). In other words, Athanasius holds that the whole history of the incarnation for the sake of human salvation is present in the Psalter. The verb σημαίνω is used instead of σκοπέω and σκοπός, and other key words from the anti-Arian writings are missing (διάνοια, χρεία),[65] but it is not surprising that the vocabulary of debate about the interpretation of Christological passages is not used in this letter of a very different character (not debate about Scripture with adversaries, but advice to friends on the direct appropriation of the Psalms). Here, when Athanasius says that all the Scriptures signify the Savior, he speaks of a "symphony of the Spirit."[66]

But not only does Athanasius find the content of the faith of the church regarding Christ in the Psalter, the Psalter itself is a kind of surrogate presence of God the Word: an inscripturation of the Word, as it were, that preceded the incarnation of the Word and served (and still serves) some of the same purposes.

> Those legislators among the Greeks possess the grace as far as speaking goes, but the Lord, being true Lord of all and one concerned for all, performed righteous acts, and not only made laws but offered himself as a model for those who wish to know the power of acting. It was indeed for this reason that he made this resound in the Psalms before his sojourn in our midst, so that just as he provided the model (τύπος) of the earthly and heavenly man in his own person, so also from the Psalms he who wants to do so can learn the emotions and dispositions of the souls, finding in them also the therapy and correction suited for each emotion.[67]

Just as Jesus himself provided humans with a τύπος, so also the Psalms can be our τύποι and χαρακτῆρες (*Ep. Marc.* 12, PG 27.24 D 11). We might say (though Athanasius does not say so in as many words) that whereas in the polemical-theological writings examined earlier the scope of Scripture becomes the scope of the faith (as dogma), in the *Letter to*

Marcellinus the Word who is signaled everywhere in the Psalter becomes the scope of life (πολιτεία). Thus the one who reads and prays the words of the Psalter will bring his life into order[66]—not just because the Psalms point to the incarnation prophetically, and not just because they provide appropriate language for all of life's various circumstances, but because of a real presence of the Word in their words. This presence is expressed forcefully when Athanasius's old man explains the power of the words of the Psalter to chase away demons: Ἔστι γὰρ ἐν τοῖς τῶν Γραφῶν ῥήμασιν ὁ Κύριος (*Ep. Marc.* 33, PG 27.45 A 13).

One might distinguish between the anti-Arian writings as polemical and the *Letter to Marcellinus* and the *Life of Antony* as pastoral (spiritual and ascetical); but the distinction must not be made too sharply. In fact, the spirit of the former writings is best understood in light of the latter. The insistence in the polemical writings on keeping to the scope of Scripture (defined as the account of the Logos as pre-incarnate and then incarnate) has as its goal the same recognition of the presence of the Lord in the words of Scripture (*Ep. Marc.* 33) that is described so vividly in the pastoral writings. Hence the connection between the scope of Scripture and εὐσέβεια. As Kannengiesser has pointed out, Athanasius's discourse about God is rooted in the ecclesial experience of salvation actualized, so that even when he engages in polemics what he is really after is catechesis;[69] and this catechesis is meant as a guide to the reordering of life through participation in the incarnate Logos.

Notes

* I wish to thank Prof. Brian E. Daley, S. J., of Weston School of Theology (Cambridge, Mass.) and Prof. Lloyd G. Patterson of Episcopal Divinity School (Cambridge, Mass.) for their helpful comments and suggestions.

[1] See the analysis and critique of his rhetorical strategies in G. C. Stead, 'Rhetorical Method in Athanasius,' *Vig. Christ.* 30 (1976) 121-137. Stead (125-28) undertakes to show examples in Athanasius of all 28 topics from Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, plus others not thought of by the philosopher or the later rhetoricians to whom Stead refers (Aelius Theon of Alexandria, Aphthonius). Especially among these latter, Stead also describes and gives names to invalid arguments used by Athanasius: *reductio retorta* (133-35), mosaic argument (135-37).

[2] Robert C. Gregg and Dennis E. Groh, *Early Arianism—A View of Salvation* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), 134, point out that their portrayal of early Arianism as primarily soteriologically motivated makes the polemical element in the *Life of Antony* all the more prominent.

[3] E.g., in Charles Kannengiesser, 'Athanasius of Alexandria vs. Arius: The Alexandrian Crisis,' in Birger A. Pearson and James E. Goehring, eds., *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 204-215. Also Hermann-Josef Sieben, 'Herméneutique de l'exégèse dogmatique d'Athanase,' in Charles Kannengiesser, ed., *Politique et théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1974), 196: "L'exégèse d'Athanase, c'est-à-dire son interprétation anti-arienne de l'Écriture...."

This paper will not attempt to say anything at all about the Arian exegesis that Athanasius is responding to, but only to look for a fundamental continuity between what Athanasius says about the scope of Scripture in his anti-Arian writings and his attitude toward Scripture in other writings. While there is disagreement as to whether Arius was primarily a brilliant intellectual who got into trouble when he attempted to "exegetize" and popularize his thought (Kannengiesser, especially in 'La Bible et la crise arienne,' in *Le Monde grec ancien et la Bible* [Bible de tous les temps. Paris: Beauchesne, 1984], 301-312) or a popular pastor who from the outset was concerned with Scripture and the problem of salvation (Gregg and Groh, *op. cit.*), it seems undeniable that Athanasius's own focus in his response to the Arians was on the problem of salvation.

[4] An argument has been made (especially by Charles Kannengiesser) that at least in their final form these works are post-Nicene. Kannengiesser (e.g., in 'La Bible et la crise arienne,' 307) says around 337. R. P. C. Hanson accepted this dating; in *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy: 318-381* (Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1988), 418, he says they date to 335 or 336. Others have not been convinced. J. C. M. van Winden's argument for an earlier dating ('On the Date of Athanasius' Apologetic Treatises,' *Vigiliae Christianae* 29 [1975] 291-295) has recently been upheld by E. P. Meijering in his demonstration of the unity of *CG* and *DI* ('Struktur und Zusammenhang des apologetischen Werkes von Athanasius,' *Vigiliae Christianae* 45 [1991], 313-326, especially 325, note 1, which discusses the state of the question and provides further bibliography). See also E. P. Meijering (with J. C. M. van Winden), *Athanasius: De Incarnatione Verbi: Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (Amsterdam: Gieben, 1989), 11ff.

[5] So Hermann-Josef Sieben, 'Athanasius über den Psalter: Analyse seines Briefes an Marcellinus,' *Theologie und Philosophie* 48 (1973) 157, without explanation. In the absence of any hard data for dating within the letter, it would seem a reasonable guess that it is later rather than earlier on the basis of the overall tone and various comments that seem to indicate that Athanasius has at the time of writing long been accustomed to persecution and exile. M. J. Rondeau, 'L'Epître à Marcellinus sur les Psaumes,' *Vig. Christ.* 22 (1968) 176-197, does not suggest a date. Robert C. Gregg, *Athanasius: The Life of Antony and the Letter to Marcellinus* (New York: Paulist, 1980), xi, states simply that the date cannot be fixed.

[6] There is a consensus that the fourth oration is not authentic. Kannengiesser has argued that neither is the third (at length in *Athanase d'Alexandrie évêque et écrivain: Une lecture des traités* Contre les Ariens [Paris: Beauchesne, 1983]; see also 'La Bible et la crise arienne,' 310ff.). In 1982, G. C. Stead found this suggestion startling (in Charles Kannengiesser, *Holy Scripture and Hellenistic Hermeneutics in Alexandrian Christology: The Arian Crisis* [Berkeley: Center for Hermeneutical Studies, 1982], 76); in 1988, R. P. C. Hanson still regarded it as "hardly ... established," though he allows that Kannengiesser's observations make it likely that the third oration was written later than the first two (*op. cit.*, 418).

[7] There would appear to be no serious doubts about the authenticity of any of these latter writings. It might seem necessary to compare the *Letter to Marcellinus* to the *Expositiones in Psalmos*, but attribution of this work to Athanasius now appears to be highly questionable: Stead ('St. Athanasius on the Psalms,' *Vig. Christ.* 39 [1985], 65-78) cites the conclusion of Gilles Dorival ('Athanase ou Pseudo-Athanase,' *RSLR* 16 [1980], 80-89) and adds his own reasons for believing that Athanasius is not the author of this work. I have not looked into the status of critical opinion regarding the other fragmentary remains of Athanasian Scripture commentary.

Regarding dates for the anti-Arian works: Hanson (*op. cit.*, 418-419) puts the *Orations Against the Arians* between 339 and 345; the *De Decretis* at 356 or 357.

[8] T. E. Pollard, 'Exegesis of the Scripture and the Arian Controversy,' *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 41 (1959), 414-29, describes six principles of Athanasian exegesis, including "scope of Scripture." Sieben ('Herméneutique de l'exégèse dogmatique d'Athanase,' 197) points out that some of the six principles noted by Pollard are not really exegetical principles; he selects scope and attention to context for his own treatment.

[9] Articles written before Kannengiesser suggested that *CA* 3 is not from the hand of Athanasius presume its authenticity: Pollard; Meredith B. Handspicker, 'Athanasius on Tradition and Scripture,' *Andover Newton Quarterly* 3 (1962) 13-29; T. F. Torrance, 'The Hermeneutics of Saint Athanasius,' *Ekklēsiastikos Pharos* 52 (1970) I, 446-468; II, 89-106; IV, 237-249; 53 (1971) 133-149; and Sieben ('Herméneutique de l'exégèse dogmatique d'Athanase').

[10] *DI* 4 (PG 25.104 A), my translation. Here and throughout this paper I will give the Greek in a note where my own translation appears in a block quotation, but not where I give the NPNF translation. The text here translated is given as follows by Robert W. Thomson, *Athanasius: Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971), 142: Ἴσως θαυμάζεις τί δήποτε περὶ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως τοῦ Λόγου προθέμενοι λέγειν, νῦν περὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων διηγούμεθα. ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἀλλότριόν ἐστι τοῦ σκοποῦ τῆς διηγήσεως. ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἡμᾶς λέγοντας περὶ τῆς εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ Σωτῆρος, λέγειν καὶ περὶ τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀρχῆς, ἵνα γινώσκῃς ὅτι ἡ ἡμῶν αἰτία ἐκείνῳ γέγονε πρόφασις τῆς καθόδου, καὶ ἡ ἡμῶν παράβασις τοῦ Λόγου τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν ἐξεκαλέσατο, ὥστε καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσαι καὶ φανῆναι τὸν Κύριον ἐν ἀνθρώποις. τῆς γὰρ ἐκείνου ἐνσωματώσεως ἡμεῖς γεγόναμεν ὑπόθεσις, καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμῶν σωτηρίαν ἐφιλανθρωπεύσατο καὶ ἐν ἀνθρωπίνῳ γενέσθαι καὶ φανῆναι σώματι.

[11] The superscription in Migne (PG 26.608 C). The letters to Serapion probably date from 359-361 (Hanson, *op. cit.*, 420).

[12] *Ep. Serap.* 2.7, *PG* 26.620 A: Ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ προφασίζονται τὸ ἐν ταῖς Παροιμίαις γεγραμμένον τὸ, 'Κύριος ἔκτισέ με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ,' καὶ ἐπιλέγουσιν ἑαυτοῖς· 'Ἰδοὺ ἔκτισε, κτίσμα ἐστίν· ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστι καὶ ἐκ τούτου δεῖξαι ὅσον πλανῶνται, μὴ εἰδότες τὸν σκοπὸν τῆς θείας Γραφῆς. Εἰ μὲν οὖν Υἱός ἐστι, μὴ λεγέσθω κτίσμα· εἰ δὲ κτίσμα, μὴ λεγέσθω Υἱός. Δέδεικται γὰρ τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν, ὅση διαφορά ἐστι κτίσματος καὶ Υἱοῦ. Καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἡ τελείωσις οὐκ εἰς κτίστην καὶ κτίσμα, ἀλλ' εἰς Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν κρατεῖ, ἀνάγκη μὴ λέγεσθαι κτίσμα, ἀλλ' Υἱὸν τὸν Κύριον. Οὐ γέγραπται οὖν; φησί. Ναὶ γέγραπται, καὶ ἀναγκαίως εἴρηται· ἀλλὰ κακῶς νοοῦσι τὸ καλῶς εἰρημένον οἱ αἱρετικοί. Εἰ γὰρ ἐνόουν καὶ ἐγίνωσκον τὸν χαρακτῆρα τοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ, οὐκ ἂν τὸν Κύριον τῆς δόξης ἔλεγον κτίσμα εἶναι, οὐδὲ προσέκοπτον τῷ γεγραμμένῳ καλῶς.

[13] On this passage, see also note 23 below.

[14] Cf. the *Festal Letter* for 339, in which Athanasius says that if the Jews had not erred concerning the Scriptures, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory (NPNF, p. 535); *Festal Letter* XIX for 347, again linking the Jewish failure to understand the Scrip-

tures, the crucifixion of the Lord of glory, and the heretics (NPNF, p. 546); and *Letter to Epictetus* 10, linking the phrase "Lord of glory" and the heretics' misunderstanding of Scripture (NPNF, p. 574).

Athanasius seems to be about to use this same verse in *CA* 2.1 (PG 26.148 B 11), but here instead of defaming the Lord of glory the Arians are said to shut themselves into the unbelief of the present-day Jews (εἰ γὰρ ἐγίνωσκον, οὐκ ἂν ἑαυτοὺς συνέκλειον εἰς τὴν τῶν νῦν Ἰουδαίων ἀπιστίαν, with perhaps a distant echo of Rom 11:22, where God shuts everyone into disobedience). The reduction of Arianism to Jewish unbelief in Jesus as Messiah is a recurrent motif. Cf. Stead's term, "reductio ad haeresim" ('Rhetorical Method in Athanasius'). On this question, cf. Rudolf Lorenz, *Arius Judaizans: Untersuchungen zur dogmengeschichtlichen Einordnung des Arius* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979).

[15] *Ep. Serap.* 2.7 (and the first phrase of 2.8), PG 26.620 B-C: Ὁ χαρακτὴρ τοίνυν τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ πίστεώς ἐστιν οὗτος, τὸν Υἱόν τοῦ Θεοῦ, Λόγον ὄντα Θεόν ("Εν ἀρχῇ γὰρ ὁ Λόγος, καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος'), σοφίαν ὄντα καὶ δύναμιν τοῦ Πατρός (Χριστὸς γὰρ Θεοῦ δύναμις καὶ Θεοῦ σοφία), τοῦτον ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων ἄνθρωπον γεγενῆσθαι διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν.... ἄνθρωπος δὲ γενόμενος καὶ οἰκονομήσας τὰ ἀνθρώπινα, τροπώσας τε καὶ καταργήσας τὸν καθ' ἡμῶν θάνατον, κάθηται νῦν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἐν αὐτῷ ὢν, καὶ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὄντος ἐν αὐτῷ, ὥσπερ ἦν ἀεὶ, καὶ ἔστι διαπαντός. Ὁ μὲν χαρακτὴρ οὗτος ἐκ τῶν ἀποστόλων διὰ τῶν Πατέρων.

C. R. B. Shapland translates the phrase Ὁ χαρακτὴρ ... τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ πίστεως "the terms in which we express our faith in Christ"—indicating that what follows is a creedal formula (in *The Letters of Saint Athanasius Concerning the Holy Spirit* [London: Epworth, 1952], 163 (and note 8).

[16] The prehistory of this term in Christian usage is beyond the scope of this paper. Sieben ('Herméneutique de l'exégèse dogmatique d'Athanase,' 207ff.) says that it is used only by Origen before Athanasius. In *De Principiis* 4, where Origen discusses Scripture, the first σκοπός of the Spirit is the hidden secrets of human destinies; the second is to veil the discourse concerning sublime realities in the words of stories that appeal to the senses. I am not sure that there is any reason at all to posit a genetic relationship between this text and Athanasius's use of σκοπός, which as Sieben himself notes (210) is quite different. Sieben, however, believes that this passage and another from Origen's John commentary probably are the sources of Athanasius's usage of the term (207). Cf. Kannengiesser's remark (*Holy Scripture and Hellenistic Hermeneutics in Alexandrian Christology: The Arian Crisis*, 88) in the course of a discussion of a different point: "Out of all the Alexandrian bishops, only Athanasius has good words for Origen, but there is no Origen in Athanasian hermeneutics."

For σκοπός in pagan exegesis, see the references given by Sieben ('Herméneutique de l'exégèse dogmatique d'Athanase,' 207, note 54). For the term in Christian exegesis after Athanasius (including the Cappadocians), see Sieben, *op. cit.*, 206-7, note 53, and Hanson, *op. cit.*, 827-28, especially note 21.

[17] Guido Müller, *Lexicon Athanasianum* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1952), 1339. This amounts to the same as LSJ's "mark or object on which one fixes the eye," e.g., an archer's target.

[18] See below, note 27.

[19] Cf. LSJ, "aim, end, object."

[20] Pollard (*op. cit.*, 423) says that the right translation is not "scope," "intention," "end," or "purpose" but rather "general bearing or drift" (with a footnote to Newman).

"The 'scope of faith' is 'the general drift of faith', and so also with the 'scope of Scripture'."

[21] *Op. cit.*, 827-828.

[22] PG 25.689 C 10: Οἱ γὰρ πολλοὶ οὐ τὴν πίστιν, οὐδὲ τὸν σκοπὸν τοῦ γράψαντος σκοποῦσιν· ἀλλ' ἢ διὰ φθόνον, ἢ δι' ἔριν, ἧς προελήφθησαν κατὰ διάνοιαν δόξης, ὡς ἐὰν θελήσωσιν αὐτοὶ, δέχονται, καὶ μεταποιοῦσι τὰ γραφέντα κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ἡδονήν.

[23] *CA* 1.37, PG 26.89 B 13-14, contrasted with ὀρθὴ διάνοια. Ἴδιος (presumably to be understood as opposed both to ἐκκλησιάστικος and to the author's meaning—these two being supposedly the same) is almost always a sign of trouble (though there is an exception in the passage from *DS* 46 quoted on p. 345 of this paper). Cf. *CA* 2.1, "their private fiction" (PG 26.148 B 4-5, τῆς ἰδίας μυθοπλαστίας); the same phrase is used at *CA* 3.10 (ταῖς ἰδίαις μυθοπλαστίαις, PG 26.341 A 2). Cf. *CA* 1.52, where their private ungodliness is their rule for interpretation (ὡς κανόνα τινὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ἀσέβειαν θέμενοι, PG 26.121 A 16-B 1). Cf. also a bit further down the page, *CA* 1.53, their own heretical poison (ἀντὶ δὲ τῆς ἀληθινῆς διανοίας τὸν ἴδιον τῆς αἱρέσεως ἰὸν ἐπισπείροντες, PG 26.121 C 10-12); the verb here for what the Arians do to the Scripture is παρερμηνεύω (PG 26.124 A 1).

[24] *CA* 2.82, PG 26.321 A, translation from NPNF, p. 393. "Comment" may be too neutral a word for ἐπίνοιαν; the ἐπι- compounds seem usually to be pejorative, suggesting the addition of something foreign and noxious. Thus the real meaning (or right understanding) of Scripture is called its διάνοια, a perverted interpretation an ἐπίνοια. The connotations of the word are made explicit at *CA* 2.1: the Arians "invent for themselves interpretations unto ungodliness" (ἐφευρίσκουσιν ἑαυτοῖς ἐπινοίας εἰς ἀσέβειαν).—But ἐπιγινώσκωμεν in *CA* 3.35 (PG 26.400 A 9) is positive.

Prof. Brian Daley points out to me that in later controversies ἐπίνοια means "creative thinking" or "fictional imagining," "what the mind constructs on its own ... usually risky business at best."

[25] The text printed in Migne (PG 26.776 B) has -νν-, but the editor points out the variants. I do not know whether there should perhaps be a single ν. Opitz's edition of *De Synodis* is not available to me.

[26] So says the Migne editor, PG 26.1166, in the *monitum* to these letters.

[27] PG 26.1168 D 1-4: οἱ δὲ ἀγαπητοὶ ἡμῶν, ἀποβλέποντες εἰς τὸν σκοπὸν τῆς ἀληθείας αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὴν οἰκονομίαν, δοξαζέτωσαν τὸν Κύριον, τὸν δεδωκότα τῇ Καππαδοκίᾳ τοιοῦτον ἐπίσκοπον....

According to Müller (*op. cit.*, 1339), this is one of only two places where Athanasius uses the phrase "scope of truth." The other is *CG* 5 (PG 25.12 C 12), where Athanasius says that just as a charioteer may run amok and miss the turning post (σκοπός), so also does the soul stray from the way to God and scope of truth. There the scope or goal is identified first by reference to Paul's pursuing κατὰ σκοπόν to the prize of the upward calling of Christ Jesus (Phil 3:14) and then with a general term: τὸ καλόν. This *CG* 5 usage would not appear to be closely related either to the scope of the truth in the *Letter to Palladius* or to the idea of the scope of Scripture. It is noted only as an instance of σκοπός (and the cognate verb σκοπέω) in a figurative sense still closely tied to the picture of an athlete keeping his eyes fixed on the goal toward which he is racing.

[28] As Robertson translates, NPNF, p. 580.

[29] This σκοπόν ... αὐτοῦ is then analogous to τὸν ἴδιον σκοπὸν in the citation earlier in this paragraph.

[30] Robertson translates οἰκονομία "his special purpose," but Müller's "officium

episcopi" (s.v. οἰκονομία, col. 973) makes better sense. Prof. Brian Daley suggests to me that it could mean "his diplomatic way of expressing himself."

[31] Hanson (*op. cit.*, 434) puts it thus: "Athanasius's hermeneutical method was to keep the basic message, the *skopos*, of the Bible firmly in sight, and then to let individual texts look after themselves."

[32] PG 26.180 A 7-10; B 10-14: Ὅτι μὲν οὖν οὐκ εἰς τὸν Δαβὶδ φθάνει τὰ τοιαῦτα ῥητά, αὐτὸς μὲν μαρτυρεῖ, Κύριον ἑαυτοῦ φάσκων εἶναι τὸν ἐρχόμενον· συνορᾶτε δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς, ὅτι ἀπέθανε.... ὁ μὲν γὰρ Δαβὶδ καὶ πάντες οἱ προφῆται ἀπέθανον, καὶ τὰ μνήματα πάντων παρ' ὑμῖν ἐστιν· ἡ δὲ γενομένη νῦν ἀνάστασις ἔδειξεν εἰς τοῦτον φθάνειν τὰ γεγραμμένα.

Torrance (*op. cit.*, 460, note 28) cites *CA* 2.16 in evidence that the "object or scope" signified by the Scriptures is Jesus Christ, perhaps encouraged by the standard English translation (p. 356 in the NPNF): "Now that these passages have not David for their scope ... the scope of these passages is Jesus." Neither σκοπός nor σκοπέω actually occurs here, but "scope" seems to be a fair translation of φθάνω. Müller (*op. cit.*, 1533, s.v. φθάνω) defines "spectant" here and gives other passages.

[33] PG 26.149 A 5-9: τὰ τοιαῦτα γὰρ πάντα ῥητὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει δύναμιν καὶ διάνοιαν βλέπουσαν εἰς εὐσέβιαν, καὶ δεικνύουσαν τὴν θεότητα τοῦ Λόγου, καὶ τὰ ἀνθρωπίνως λεγόμενα περὶ αὐτοῦ, διὰ τὸ γεγενῆσθαι αὐτὸν καὶ υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου.

Also along the line of the incarnation as the διάνοια of the Scriptures: *CA* 2.55 (PG 26.264 C 3-4).

[34] PG 26.309 C 9-312 A 1: Ἦρκει μὲν οὖν ταῦτα πρὸς ἀπόδειξιν τοῦ μὴ εἶναι κτίσμα τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὀρθὴν εἶναι τὴν τοῦ ῥητοῦ διάνοιαν. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ διερευνώμενον τὸ ῥητὸν, ὀρθὸν ἔχει πανταχόθεν τὸν νοῦν, ἀκόλουθον καὶ τοῦτον τὸν νοῦν εἰπεῖν.

[35] *CA* 3.1, PG 26.321 B 11-12: ὀρθὴν ἐχόντων τὴν διάνοιαν, καὶ δεικνύντων τὴν εἰς Χριστὸν εὐσέβειαν; *CA* 3.18, PG 26.360 C 4-5: πρὸς τὴν οὕτω φανερὰν καὶ εὐσεβῆ διάνοιαν, καὶ τὴν ἐν ἡμῖν ὀρθὴν πίστιν; *CA* 3.19, PG 26.364 A 12-14: Ὥσπερ δὲ ταῦτα καλῶς καὶ ὀρθῶς διανοούμεθα, οὕτω καὶ τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην ἀνάγνωσμα τῆν αὐτῆν ἔχει διάνοιαν; *CA* 3.20, PG 26.265 C 1-3 (= *CA* 3.21, first sentence, in NPNF): ... καὶ τὸ λεγόμενον ... ὀρθὴν πάλιν ἔχει τὴν διάνοιαν; *CA* 3.35, PG 26.400 A 8-10: ἡμεῖς δέ, τὸν σκοπὸν τῆς πίστεως ἔχοντες, ἐπιγινώσκωμεν ἃ διανοοῦνται οὗτοι κακῶς, ὀρθὴν ἔχοντα τὴν διάνοιαν; *CA* 3.37, PG 26.401 C 9-10: περὶ δὲ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνως λεγομένων περὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος, καὶ ταῦτα πάλιν εὐσεβῆ τὴν διάνοιαν ἔχει.

In *De Decretis*: *DD* 13, PG 25.445 B 12-13; *DD* 23, PG 25.456 D 14-15, regarding the term ὁμοούσιος; ἐχούσης καὶ τῆς λέξεως ταύτης ὑγιῆ τὴν διάνοιαν καὶ τὴν ἀπόδειξιν.

[36] *Op. cit.*, 323-324.

[37] But only two of those from *CA* 3 in note 35. See the differences noted between *CA* 1-2 and *CA* 3 on p. 351 below.

[38] Pollard (*op. cit.*, 427) says that διάνοια "is but another name for 'the custom of Scripture,' " but in fact ἔθος seems to have more to do with a way of speaking. Note the similar lumping together of σκοπός with ἰδίωμα, τάξις, and ἔθος by Torrance (*op. cit.*, 456).

[39] *Op. cit.*, 213.

[40] PG 25.196 C 5-7: Ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὴν ἐκ τῶν Γραφῶν ἔρευναν καὶ γνῶσιν ἀληθῆ χρεία βίου καλοῦ καὶ ψυχῆς καθαρᾶς καὶ τῆς κατὰ Χριστὸν ἀρετῆς. Thomson (*op. cit.*, 275) translates πρός "in addition to" rather than "for" (NPNF), but even with that translation the result is about the same.

[41] PG 26.124 B 6-14: Γέγραπται μὲν γὰρ, τοσούτῳ κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων· τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξετάσαι πρῶτον ἀναγκαῖον· δεῖ δὲ, ὡς ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς θείας Γραφῆς προσήκει ποιεῖν, καὶ ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστιν, οὕτω καὶ ἐνταῦθα, καθ' ὃν εἶπεν ὁ Ἀπόστολος καιρὸν, καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον, καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα,

διόπερ ἔγραφε, πιστῶς ἐκλαμβάνειν, ἵνα μὴ παρὰ ταῦτα ἢ καὶ παρ' ἕτερόν τι τούτων ἀγνοῶν ὁ ἀναγινώσκων ἔξω τῆς ἀληθινῆς διανοίας γένηται.

[42] PG 25.448 A 8-17: Ἆρ' οὖν μάτην γέγραπται τοῦτο τὸ ῥητόν; Τοῦτο γὰρ πάλιν ἐκεῖνοι περιβομβοῦσιν, ὡς ἀγέλη κωνώπων. Οὐχί γε, οὐ μάτην γέγραπται, ἀλλὰ καὶ μάλα ἀναγκαίως· καὶ γὰρ καὶ κτίζεσθαι λέγεται; ἀλλ' ὅτε γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος· ἀνθρώπου γὰρ ἴδιον τοῦτο. Τὴν δὲ διάνοιαν ταύτην εὑρήσει καλῶς ἐν τοῖς λογίοις κειμένην ὁ μὴ πάρεργον ἡγούμενος τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν καιρὸν καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα, καὶ τὴν χρείαν τῶν γεγραμμένων ἐρευνῶν, καὶ οὕτω τὰ ἀναγνώσματα διακρίνων καὶ διανοούμενος.

[43] Müller (*op. cit.*, 1579) defines χρεία in these passages as "id, quod spectant verba."

[44] 'Rhetorical Method in Athanasius,' 123.

[45] 'Herméneutique de l'exégèse dogmatique d'Athanase,' 198-200. In the same article (200-205), Sieben also critiques Pollard's reduction of these categories to the principle of "paying attention to the context of Scripture" and provides a more substantial analysis of passages in Athanasius that refer to them.

[46] Not that he was incapable of using these terms, like σκοπός (*DS* 46, noted above, p. 345), for writings other than Scripture: thus he excuses some questionably orthodox things that Dionysius wrote by supposing that some unspecified καιροῦ καὶ προσώπου πρόφασις εἵλκυσεν αὐτὸν τοιαῦτα γράψαι (PG 25.485 B 3-4).

Sieben's summary (*op. cit.*, 203) is worth noting: "... 'personne, temps et occasion' ne sont pas des aspects du contexte, dont la perception déterminerait le sens littéral d'un passage; ce sont plutôt, résumés en une formule succincte, les éléments d'une méthode d'interprétation de l'Écriture qui tend à mettre en lumière le sens spirituel, ou si l'on préfère christologique d'un passage." He suggests that the triad comes from the traditional, allegorical interpretation of Scripture in the church.

Be that as it may, it nevertheless seems clear that if Athanasius is not the Reformed exegete that Pollard wants him to be (note the invoking of the Westminster Confession [Pollard, *op. cit.*, 424]), neither does he push allegorical interpretation as far as some of his predecessors. Kannengiesser (*Athanase d'Alexandrie évêque et écrivain*, 407) seems to hit the nail on the head: "Athanase ne répète pas les leçons d'allégorisme ou les règles de l'exégèse spirituelle d'un Origène, qu'il connaît pourtant par ailleurs, mais il préfère s'exercer à sa propre interprétation dogmatique et actualisante de la Bible." Cf. Hanson (*op. cit.*, 828): "We cannot even contrast in any clear-cut way the pro-Nicenes as users of allegory and the Arians as rejecters of it." Everybody rejected Origen's excesses, he says, but nobody rejected allegorization altogether.

[47] As Sieben (*op. cit.*, 211) points out *contra* Pollard. The scope of Scripture is a material principle. Cf. Torrance, *op. cit.*, 454: "Applied to the Scriptures σκοπός refers to the objective realities indicated by the words or to the principal end at which they aim."

[48] See his comments on Scriptural ἔθος (*CA* 2.53; 3.18; 3.30) and ἰδίωμα (*CA* 2.4). Pollard lists these as the third and fifth of Athanasius's "clearly defined exegetical principles" (*op. cit.*, 419) but it may be that Pollard defines them more clearly than Athanasius does. Sieben (*op. cit.*, 197) says that Pollard's principles are "énumerés à notre avis d'une manière trop schématique" and (note 8) points out a few of the problems with Pollard's list.

[49] Ἐραυνάω is a Koine form of ἐρευνάω, Athanasius's word. The quotation is from John 5:39, with the middle part of the verse left out.

[50] NPNF translation, p. 409, with brackets added; the Greek in parentheses is from PG 26.384 C 7-385 B 1.

[51] And elsewhere; cf. the handful of references in Müller (*op. cit.*, 1320).

[52] Cf. φρόνημα in *CA* 2.82 (quoted above, p. 345) and the many references given by Müller (*op. cit.*, 1546-1547).

[53] Cf. Kannengiesser (*Athanase d'Alexandrie évêque et écrivain*, 345-46): "... le 'double enseignement' de l'Écriture s'annonce dans les terms d'une considération abstraite et systématique de la nature propre à chacune des substances ainsi visées."

[54] The same point is made just down the page, after Athanasius cites three regulative texts (John 1:1-3, 14; Phil 2:6-8), then concludes, ἀπὸ τούτων γὰρ, τῇ αὐτῇ διανοίᾳ διερχόμενός τις πᾶσαν τὴν Γραφὴν, ὄψεται... (PG 26.385 C 1-2, where τῷ stands in the text instead of τῇ). The instrumental dative makes διάνοια here the stance of the interpreter rather than an intention resident in the text itself.

[55] Cf. the sharp delineation of opposed camps a bit earlier, with Christians possessing the right interpretation of the gospels: Χριστιανοὶ γάρ ἐσμεν, ὦ 'Αρειανοί, Χριστιανοί ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς, ἡμῶν τε ἴδιον καλῶς τὰ Εὐαγγέλια νοεῖν περὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος, καὶ μήτε μετὰ 'Ιουδαίων λιθάζειν αὐτόν (PG 26.384 A 6-9). Athanasius exclusively claims the name of Christian and along with it a privileged hermeneutical position.

The word χριστομάχοι is common enough in *CA* 1-2 and elsewhere, but quite heavily used in *CA* 3; in Müller (*op. cit.*, 1583) I count three occurrences in *CA* 1, six in *CA* 2, but fifteen in *CA* 3.

[56] Incidentally, the word θεοτόκος, which appears in the section quoted from *CA* 3.29, occurs four times in *CA* 3, once in *CA* 4, nowhere in *CA* 1-2, and seven times in the rest of the writings covered by Müller (*op. cit.*, 650).

The same creedal style appears in the quotation above (p. 343 and note 15) from *Ep. Serap.* 2.7; there, however, the "twofold account" is not made explicit.

[57] In *CA* 1.53 (cited above, note 23) he had accused the Arians of having posited a κανών—namely, their ἀσέβεια.

[58] Athanasius seems to have begun using John 5:39 in this way only late; the only other two instances are in the *Encyclical Letter of the Bishops of Egypt* (written in 356) and the famous *Festal Letter* XXXIX for the year 367, in which Athanasius also lists the canonical books of Scripture.

[59] PG 26.400 A 8-10; text given above in note 35.

[60] *CA* 3.58, PG 26.445 A 12-15: Ταῦτα εἰ οὕτως καὶ οἱ Χριστομάχοι διενοοῦντο, τόν τε σκοπὸν τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν ὡς ἄγκυραν τῆς πίστεως ἐπεγίνωσκον, οὔτ' ἂν ἐναυάγησαν περὶ τὴν πίστιν....

[61] See p. 347 above for the citation from PG 26.101 C 1-2.

[62] The question of the authenticity of *CA* 3 will be decided on much broader grounds. All this paper can do is note a difference of emphasis between *CA* 1-2 and *CA* 3 on this particular point. On this particular point, however, Kannengiesser's description (*Athanase d'Alexandrie évêque et écrivain*, 407-408) of *CA* 3 as an impressive superstructure over against a simpler narrative approach in *CA* 1-2 seems to hold up.

[63] This is Harnack's evaluation: that Athanasius broke free of the cosmological speculation that had dominated theology from Origen to Eusebius (Torrance, *op. cit.*, 447, citing *History of Dogma*, vol. 4, p. 28f.; Kannengiesser, 'Les Citations bibliques du traité Athanasien 'Sur l'incarnation du Verbe' et les 'Testimonia',' in *La Bible et les Pères* [Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1971], 136).

[64] Cf. Kannengiesser, *Holy Scripture and Hellenistic Hermeneutics*, 88: "...Athanasius' fundamental presupposition in reading Scripture is not found in Origen, or Alexander, or Dionysius; it is the presupposition that Holy Scripture, being divine revelation, means the

revelation of the divine mystery of salvation, experienced here and now, by Christians. His interpretation starts from the concrete experience of the faithful community."

[65] Müller's *Lexicon* covers only volumes 25 and 26 of Migne, and I have no other index at hand, so these are just my observations on the basis of a quick reread of the part of the letter that seemed more likely to use such language.

[66] *Ep. Marc.* 9, PG 27.17 D 1-3: Οὐκ ἀγνοῶν δὲ πάλιν ἔλεγεν, ὅτι καὶ ἐν ἑκάστῃ βίβλῳ τῆς Γραφῆς τὰ αὐτὰ περὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἐξαιρέτως σημαίνεται· καὶ ἔστι τοῦτο πάσαις αὐταῖς ἀπάγγελμα, καὶ συμφωνία ἡ αὐτὴ τοῦ Πνεύματος.

[67] *Ep. Marc.* 13, PG 27.25 B; translation from Gregg, *Athanasius: The Life of Antony and the Letter to Marcellinus*, 112. On this passage, cf. Sieben, "Athanasius über den Psalter: Analyse seines Briefes an Marcellinus," 166.

[68] *Ep. Marc.* 13; cf. Sieben, 'Athanasius über den Psalter: Analyse seines Briefes an Marcellinus,' 164.

[69] La Bible et la crise arienne,' 307-308. Kannengiesser here is referring specifically to *CA* 1-2.

1043 Goffs Falls Road, *Manchester*, New Hampshire 03103, USA

Vigiliae Christianae 47 (1993), 363-373, © E. J. Brill, Leiden

RELIGIO, PHILOSOPHIA UND *PULCHRITUDO*

IHR ZUSAMMENHANG NACH AUGUSTINUS, *DE VERA RELIGIONE*

VON

JOSEF LOESSL, S. J.

In *vera rel.* hat Augustin die Frage nach der einen, wahren Religion nicht nur aufgegriffen, sondern im Hinblick auf die christliche Religion auch eindeutig beantwortet. Anders als viele moderne Beiträge zur religionsphilosophisch-fundamentaltheologischen Diskussion geht *vera rel.* nicht vom »Begriff« oder »Phänomen Religion« aus.[1] Es ist nicht ein Werk »über Religion/en«, sondern über den Gegenstand der einen wahren Religion, über Gott. Augustin will die auf diesen Sachverhalt bezogene christliche Glaubenslehre nicht nur nacherzählen, sondern sie unter dem Aspekt der Einheit von Begriff und Vollzug und auf den dementsprechenden Begriff des Einen hin untersuchen. Gott den Einen (*unus deus*) in seinem Wesen als Prinzip allen Werdens (*naturarum omnium*) herauszustellen, ist die Aufgabe des Gedankengangs von *vera rel.*, wie sie zu Beginn des Buches umrissen wird.[2]

Unter der Voraussetzung, daß religiöser Vollzug ganzheitlich menschlich und der Mensch ein Wesen ist, dessen Handeln Vernunft voraussetzt und dessen Denken immer auch das Ganze, Eine seines Handelns umfaßt,[3] ergibt sich als Gegenstand von Philosophie und Religion gleichermaßen der eine, wahre Gott als ewig unveränderliche Trinität und die veränderliche Welt als Schöpfung.[4]

In diesem Zusammenhang stellt sich nun die Frage, ob überhaupt, und wenn, inwieweit Augustin zwischen Philosophie und Religion (*philosophia* und *religio*) unterscheidet und welche Kriterien sein Vorgehen bestimmen. Daß er eine Unterscheidung vornimmt, zeigt sich, wie im folgenden genauer ausgeführt werden soll, allein schon daran, daß er den Begriff *religio* in seiner Bedeutung klar definiert (I). Freilich entspricht dieser Abgrenzung des Begriffes *religio* eine enge Verknüpfung und Zuordnung der Begriffe *religio* und *philosophia* im Bereich der *vera religio* (II).

Wie aber wird diese Zuordnung im einzelnen bewerkstelligt? Bei der

Untersuchung dieser Frage rückt ein dritter Begriff in den Blick, der der Schönheit (*pulchritudo*).[5] Auf dem Hintergrund seiner Bedeutung in der neuplatonischen Ästhetik, wo er eng mit dem Begriff der Wahrheit verknüpft ist, fungiert er in *vera rel.* als Kriterium für die Wahrheit einer, bzw. *der* einen wahren, der christlichen Religion (III).

I

E. Feil hat darauf hingewiesen, daß Augustins *vera rel.* als einzige Schrift in der ganzen Patristik den Begriff *religio* im Titel führt.[6] Dagegen fiel W. C. Smith die weite Verbreitung des Wortes *religio* auf: »Alle Väter verwendeten es«.[7] Statt von *religio*, so Feil, sei jedoch bei den meisten Vätern von *fides* die Rede und wenn *religio* auftauche, dann eben nicht als Titel einer ganzen Schrift, sondern als Kapitelüberschrift.[8] In diesem Sinne sei *vera rel.* eine Ausnahme, wie übrigens auch die Weiterführung der dort entwickelten Gedanken in *civ.*[9]

Demgegenüber führt Smith eine Reihe auch christlicher Autoren vor Augustin an, die mit dem Begriff *religio* arbeiteten.[10] Für ihn stellt sich das Gegenüber von *religio* und *fides* weniger als sprachliches denn als inhaltliches Problem, nämlich in bezug darauf, wie Augustin die beiden Begriffe miteinander in Beziehung setzt: Demnach ist Religion einerseits nicht ein »System von Geboten und Glaubenssätzen« oder »institutionalisierte, äußerlich wahrnehmbare geschichtliche Überlieferung«, sondern »persönliche Begegnung mit der Herrlichkeit und Liebe Gottes«. Der Glaube der Kirche ist dementsprechend andererseits weniger ein subjektiver, individueller Akt, sondern vielmehr diejenige Institution, die diese Beziehung in der Geschichte ermöglicht.[11]

Demnach verhielte sich Augustins Verständnis von *fides* und *religio* genau umgekehrt zum heutigen Verständnis von Religion als äußerem Rahmen und Glaube als innerem Vollzug. Nach ihm wäre *religio* die von innen her wachsende Beziehung zu Gott und *fides* der von außen gesetzte Rahmen zur Ermöglichung der Entfaltung dieser Beziehung. Trotzdem wird *religio* auch in *vera rel.* in einen engen Zusammenhang mit *fides* und, präzisierend, mit *fides catholica* und *disciplina catholica* gebracht.[12] Überdies steht es in nächster Nähe zu *christiana lex, disciplina omnis religionis, ecclesia catholica, doctrina* etc.[13] Augustin scheint beides wichtig zu sein: Die Freiheit des inneren Menschen in seiner Entscheidung für die Wahrheit und Gott, die *philosophia* und *religio* zu ein und demselben Vollzug machen (*vera rel.* V.8.26) und die im

Glauben (*fides*) übernommene Tatsache, daß die Religion, an die man sich zu halten habe, die christliche sei (*vera rel.* VII.12.37).

Religio als *cultus*, Verehrung, steht zunächst ganz in der Tradition des römischen *cultus deorum*, scheint also, im Kontext des heidnisch religiösen Pluralismus, von einem gewissen Hang zur Beliebigkeit, zur Ausklammerung der Wahrheits- und Gottesfrage getragen zu sein.[14] Doch hatte schon Cicero die kultischen Begriffe *sanctitas* und *religio* mit dem profan-ethischen *pietas* in Verbindung gebracht, womit innerhalb der stoischen Tradition auch bereits auf die Gottesfrage verwiesen war.[15] Bei Augustin läuft dies folgerichtig auf eine Annäherung der Begriffe *religio* und *anima* hinaus.[16] Wie *religio* auf der einen Seite als innere Größe dem äußeren Rahmen der *fides* entspricht und nach außen hin verbindliche Züge annimmt, so entspricht sie als äußere Größe einem inneren Vollzug, dessen Geistigkeit ebenfalls nicht weiter reduzierbar ist.

Deus und *anima* waren in *ord.* als die ersten Gegenstände der Philosophie genannt worden.[17] »In diesem Zusammenhang nimmt Augustinus auch die Etymologie von *religio* auf, aus der er auf deren Bedeutung schließt, nämlich zu Gott zu streben und ihm allein die Seele zu verbinden: *Religet ergo nos religio uni omnipotenti deo.* Und dieser Gott, der zu ehren ist, ist der Dreifaltige«.[18]

Schon allein der Begriff *religio*, wie er *vera rel.* zugrundeliegt, führt also weit über die Frage nach dem »Phänomen Religion« oder dessen anthropologische Dimension hinaus und berührt die Gottesfrage. Das liegt daran, daß er von Anfang an eng mit den verwandten Begriffen *fides, philosophia, sanctitas* und *pietas*, und als Relationsbegriff mit dem ihm zugrundeliegenden Subjekt, bzw. Objekt *deus* und *anima* verbunden ist. Seine eigentliche Bestimmung erfährt *religio* in *vera rel.* jedoch von einem anderen Begriff, dem der Wahrheit, *veritas.*

II

Mit dem Wahrheitsbegriff öffnet sich der Blick auf die Problematik des Verhältnisses von *religio* und *philosophia*, die ja gleichbedeutend ist mit der Problematik des Wahrheitsanspruchs im religiösen Bereich, mit der Forderung nach und den Anforderungen an *vera religio*, wahre(r) Religion.

Obwohl Augustin den Begriff *religio* zunächst aus dem Kontext des religiösen Pluralismus des spätantiken Heidentums entlehnt, nimmt er

ihm, was noch an Beliebigkeit in ihm stecken könnte, dadurch, daß er ihn als Streben nach Gott, dem Einen[19] identifiziert. Dies kann deshalb nur in einer einzigen *religio* vollzogen werden, weil ihm, dem Wesen des Einen gemäß, nur eine einzige, die wahre Form des Kultes und der Lehre entsprechen kann, die *vera religio.* Diese aber ist für Augustin in der gegenwärtigen Situation die *christiana religio,*[20] auch wenn er in *retr.* unterstreicht, daß selbst diese »einzig wahre Form der Gottesverehrung« eine historische Genese durchgemacht hat und noch weiter durchmacht, bei der sie ihrerseits selbst noch einmal aus der Vielheit in die eine Wahrheit zusammengeführt wird.[21]

Die Pluralität der *religiones*, die scheinbare Beliebigkeit ihrer Ausübung und die mangelnde innere Logik ihrer Lehrgebäude, mitbedingt durch ihre weite Verbreitung und mangelnde Bildung ihrer Mitglieder, war mit einer der Hauptgründe dafür gewesen, daß *religio* von der heidnischen Philosophie nicht als wahrheitsfähig betrachtet und beurteilt wurde, obwohl schon Cicero eine Verbindung zwischen Religion als Verehrung Gottes im Kult und Philosophie als wahrer Erkenntnis Gottes gesehen hatte.[22]

Der historische Kontext dieses Problems ist in *vera rel.* im narrativ gehaltenen Einleitungsteil kurz angerissen:[23] Philosophie, so steht dort, hatte von Anfang an auch Religionskritik betrieben, allein schon dadurch, daß sie versucht hatte, den Religionsbegriff zu definieren und das Religionsphänomen von anderen Phänomenen der Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte zu scheiden.[24] Ihr Versagen hatte nach Augustin nicht darin gelegen, daß sie nicht die richtigen Theorien entwickelt hätte, um eine solche Kritik der Religion durchzuführen, sondern daß sie nicht fähig war, mit ihren Methoden *religio* so zu reformieren, daß diese zum Heil möglichst vieler Menschen geführt hätte. Der einzige Philosoph, der das im Ansatz versucht hatte, Sokrates,[25] war im Tod gescheitert, sein Nachfolger Plato und dessen Schüler trieben Philosophie als Wahrheitssuche im Verborgenen.[26]

Erst in Christus, so Augustin weiter, und in der historischen Wirksamkeit seiner Botschaft[27] sei das Streben der Platoniker nach wahrer Erkenntnis (Gottes) mit der Gottesverehrung der vielen so zusammengewachsen, daß Plato selbst, würde er noch leben, die Wahrheit dieser Religion bekennen würde,[28] in der das, was in der Philosophie rein im Geist geschaut wird (*pura mente videri*[29]) von einem göttlicher Ehre würdigen Mann (*vir divinus*[30]) verwirklicht worden ist, der tatsächlich in einer Gegend, in der seit altersher der eine Gott allein verehrt wird

(*una regione terrarum, in qua sola unus colebatur deus*), gelebt und zur Umkehr gerufen hat.[31]

III

In *vera rel.* redet Augustin von einer Einheit von *philosophia* und *religio*.[32] Gerade von der heidnischen antiken Philosophie her und gerade auch im Hinblick auf das Christentum wurde nun aber streng zwischen *philosophia* und *religio* unterschieden. Andererseits freilich hatte die Kirche ihren Glauben (*fides*) als Lehrgebäude analog und oft in enger Anlehnung an die heidnische Philosophie entwickelt, allerdings ohne sich, von wenigen Ausnahmen abgesehen, mit jener zu identifizieren.

Wenn Augustin sich entscheidet, zur Verschönerung (*pulchritudo*), d.h. zur geistigen Vertiefung der religiösen Tradition (der *fides christiana*) auf *philosophia* als *religio* zurückzugreifen, macht er damit eine Aussage über seinen eigenen Zugang zur Glaubenstradition (*fides*) der Kirche, nämlich über die Philosophie, genauer, über die Philosophie von der wahren Religion.

Die Rede von *pulchritudo* und *pulchrum* ist für Augustin keine Nebensache.[33] Der Begriff der *pulchritudo* taucht in *vera rel.* über 30mal auf.[34] Analog ist vom Ursprung der Schönheit (*prima pulchritudo*, XXXIX.72.201) wie auch von der Schönheit der Körper die Rede, die sowohl in sich selber (*sui generis*) schön, als auch äußerste Spuren jener ursprünglichen Schönheit (*extrema vestigia illius pulchritudinis*, XXII.42.115) seien. In jedem Fall aber gilt: Etwas ist schön aufgrund der Vernunft (*ratione pulchrum*, XLIII.80.229), die als Ordnungsprinzip über allem steht. Es wird in seiner Schönheit durch die geistige Schau der ursprünglichen Schönheit als schön erfaßt (*ad contemplandam summam pulchritudinem mens*, XXXIII.61.175). Umgekehrt verweist die Schönheit von etwas immer auch auf dessen Wahrheit und Vernünftigkeit. Von der Themenstellung von *vera rel.*, eben der Frage nach der Wahrheitsfähigkeit von *religio* und damit nach dem Zusammenhang von *religio* und *philosophia* her ergibt sich demnach als wichtigstes Kriterium für die Wahrheit von *religio* die Schönheit, *pulchritudo*. Sie ist das entscheidende Bindeglied, der Mittelbegriff zwischen sinnlich konkreter *religio* (*cultus*) und abstrakter *philosophia* und verweist erstere auf ihre Verpflichtung gegenüber der Wahrheit, letztere aber auf die Angewiesenheit der reinen Wahrheitserkenntnis auf die Konkretheit des Vielen, nur sinnlich Erfaßbaren in Raum und Zeit. Dessen Schönheit

wird von der Wahrheit des Höchsten offenbart, während es selbst diese Wahrheit bis in seine niedersten Niederungen hinein widerspiegelt und auf die Schönheit der höchsten Wahrheit verweist.

Die Funktion des Begriffes der *pulchritudo* in diesem Zusammenhang wird am deutlichsten in der Beurteilung anderer, von der christlichen als *vera religio* verschiedenen *religiones*: So macht Augustin an einer Stelle dem Judentum seiner Zeit und Kultur den Vorwurf, es stehe für eine zwar im Prinzip wahrheitsfähige, de facto aber unzureichend verwirklichte Religion, da es zwar den einen, allmächtigen Gott verehre, aber so, daß es statt geistig-geistlicher nur weltliche Früchte von ihm erwarte. Damit stünde es zwar bereits über den vielfältigen Formen indifferenten Polytheismus' und übertreffe auch die Versuche, letztere durch allumfassende Theorien miteinander zu versöhnen, hebe sich aber durch seine Diesseitsbezogenheit negativ von der Schönheit (*pulchritudo*) der Kirche ab.[35]

Diese Kritik Augustins am Judentum steht im Kontext einer umfassenderen Kritik am Heidentum, an der Gnosis und am Manichäismus, sowie an den Häresien und Schismen innerhalb der christlichen Religion.[36] Am Ende des Abschnitts, in dem all diese Fehlformen von Religion aufgelistet werden, steht ein Bekenntnis zum christlich katholischen Glauben: *Die* Religion (*quaerenda religio*) ist nicht in der verwirrenden Vielfalt heidnischer Kulte (*in confusione paganorum*), bei der schmutzigen Wäsche, die die Häretiker waschen (*in purgamentis haereticorum*), in der Lauheit der Schismatiker (*in languore schismaticorum*) oder bei der Blindheit der Juden (*in caecitate Iudaeorum*) zu suchen, sondern einzig und allein bei den katholischen Christen, welche auch »Orthodoxe« genannt werden, d.h. bei denen, die auf die reine und gesunde Lehre achten und in rechter Weise Nachfolge üben (*i.e. integritatis custodes et recta sectantes*).[37]

Es zeigt sich: Augustins Anwendung des Kriteriums der *pulchritudo* als Wahrheitskriterium — er zieht es aus der heidnischen platonischen Philosophie heran, deren Streben nach Wahrheit und Einheit er in der Theorie mit seiner eigenen Auffassung von *vera religio* identisch, in der Praxis freilich unzureichend verwirklicht sieht — steht im Kontext der christlichen, katholischen, kirchlichen *fides*. Ähnlich wie zwischen *religio* und *fides* wird auch zwischen *philosophia* und kirchlich verpflichteter Weitergabe von *fides* ein Unterschied gemacht: *philosophia* begründet nicht den Glauben, sichert ihn jedoch gegen verschiedenste Irrtümer

ab. Sie steht im Dienst wahrer Religion als deren vernünftigstes Mittel, das Gründen und Münden von allem im Einen zu gewährleisten. Kriterium der Wahrheit aber ist die Schönheit, *pulchritudo*, die, auf verschiedenste Weise abgestuft, in allen Aspekten geschöpflichen Seins aufscheint und mit ihnen auf die ihr eigene vollendete Form im einen, dreifaltigen Gott selbst verweist.

NOTES

[1] Vgl. etwa Ebeling, G., *Wort und Glaube* Bd. 1, Tübingen 1966, 129f. Pannenberg, W., *Systematische Theologie* Bd. 1, Göttingen 1988, 135ff. Wuchterl, K., *Kritik und Analyse der religiösen Vernunft*, Stuttgart 1989. Verweyen, H.-J., *Gottes letztes Wort*, Düsseldorf 1991, 14f. 134, 288-292.

[2] *vera rel.* I.1.1. *unus deus...principium naturarum omnium...* CCSL 32, 187ff.

[3] *vera rel.* V.8.26. *non aliam esse philosophiam...et aliam religionem.*

[4] *vera rel.* VIII.14.43. *cognita aeternitate trinitatis et mutabilitate creaturae.* XVIII.35.94. *deus incommutabilis trinitas...per summam sapientiam ea fecit et summa benignitate conservat.*

[5] Zur Bedeutung des Begriffes der Schönheit im Werk Augustins vgl. neuerdings Harrison, C., *Beauty and revelation in the thought of St. Augustine*, Oxford 1992.

[6] Feil, E., *Religio. Die Geschichte eines neuzeitlichen Grundbegriffs vom Frühchristentum bis zur Reformation*, Göttingen 1986, 69. Einzige mögliche Ausnahme s. Anm. 8. Außer im Titel ist in *vera rel.* 31mal von *religio* die Rede: I.1.1. *Cum omnis vitae bonae ac beatae via* in vera religione *sit constituta, qua unus deus colitur*...3. *[philosophos] aliud eos* in religione *suscepisse cum populo et aliud eodem ipso populo defendisse privatim.* III.3.8. *Christianis temporibus quaenam* religio *potissimum tenenda sit*... V.8.25. religionem *ab eis non esse quaerendam qui*... 26. ...*non aliam esse philosophiam, id est sapientiae studium, et aliam* religionem... 9.29. *neque in languore schismaticorum neque in caecitate Iudaeorum* quaerenda religio *est*... VII.12.36. *Quam ob rem...Romaniane, quid* de vera religione *sentirem*... 12.37. ...*tenenda est nobis* christiana religio... 13.39. *Huius* religionis *sectandae caput est historia et prophetia dispensationis temporalis divinae providentiae pro salute generis humani in aeternam vitam reformandi atque reparandi.* X.18.51. *Quam ob rem sit tibi manifestum atque perceptum nullum errorem* in religione *esse potuisse*... 19.53. *Non ergo »creaturae potius quam creatori« serviamus nec evanescamus »in cogitationibus nostris«, et* perfecta religio *est.* 55. *Ea est nostris temporibus* christiana religio, *quam cognoscere ac sequi securissima et certissima salus est.* XIV.27.74. *Quibus sublatis christiana lex et disciplina* omnis religionis *auferatur necesse est.* XXV.46.127. ...*ita* in religione *qui ad unum vocant, eorum maior et fide dignior esse debet auctoritas.* XXXVI.68.192. *Aliqui et lunae splendorem* religione *dignum putant;* 193. *sed inter hos illi sibi videntur* religiosissimi *qui universam simul creaturam*... XXXVIII.69.194. *Est enim...cultus simulacrorum, quo phantasmata sua colunt*...religionis *nomine observant.* L.99.278. ...*quo uno cognito omnis ab animis protervitas puerilis excluditur et introducitur* sacrosancta religio. LV.108.295. *Non sit nobis* religio *in phantasmatis nostris*; 296. *non*...religio *humanorum operum cultus; non*...religio *cultus bestiarum; non*...religio *cultus hominum mortuorum,* 297. *non*...religio *cultus daemonum, quia*

omnis superstitio cum sit magna poena hominum et periculosissima turpitudo 109.298. *non*...religio *terrarum cultus et aquarum*...*non*...religio *etiam purioris aeris et serenioris cultus,* 299. *non*...religio *cultus corporum aethereorum atque caelestium* 300. *non*...religio *cultus illius vitae qua dicuntur arbores vivere* 110.301. *non*...religio *vel ipsa perfecta et sapiens anima rationalis sive in ministerio universitatis sive in ministerio partium stabilita* 111.307. *cum ipsis adiuvantibus ad unum deum tendentes et ei uni religantes animas nostras — unde* religio *dicta creditur — omni superstitione careamus?* 113.310. *religet ergo nos* religio *uni omnipotenti deo.*

[7] »All the early Fathers use the term.« Smith, W. C., *The meaning and end of religion*, (1962) Philadelphia 1991, 25.

[8] Z. B. Laktanz, *Divinae institutiones* II: *De falsa religione*, IV: *De vera sapientia et religione.* Laktanz' Schrift wird deshalb auch als Quelle für Augustins *De vera religione* ins Spiel gebracht, z.B. Du Roy, O., *L'intelligence de la foi en la Trinité selon Saint Augustin. Genèse de sa théologie trinitaire jusqu'en 391*, Paris 1966, 313f., Anm. 14. Zum Begriff *fides* beim frühen Augustin s. Löhrer, M., *Der Glaubensbegriff des heiligen Augustinus in seinen ersten Schriften bis zu den »Confessiones«*, Einsiedeln 1955.

[9] Feil 1986, 68.

[10] Smith 1991, 25, Anm. 20 verweist auf Tertullian u.a., beklagt aber das Fehlen genauerer Verweise. Die bringt Theiler, W., *Porphyrius und Augustin* (Halle an der Saale 1933), in: *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus*, Berlin 1966, 160-251, 168 (1933, 7): Tertullian *Apol.* 24,2. Minucius Felix *Oct.* 1,5. Eusebius *Laus Const.* 213,32...

[11] »For this writer *religion* is no system of observances or beliefs, nor an historical tradition, institutionalized or susceptible of outside observation. Rather it is a vivid and personal confrontation with the splendour and the love of God. The church [und ihr *fides*] for him, exists in order to make this relationship possible«. Smith 1991, 29.

[12] *vera rel.* IX.17.49. *Neque nunc eorum opiniones refellimus, quod partim iam fecimus, partim quantum deus siverit faciemus, sed in hoc opere quomodo adversus eos fides catholica tuta sit et quomodo non perturbent animum ea quibus commoti homines in eorum cedunt sententiam, rationibus quas dominus dare dignatur quantum possumus demonstramus.* VIII.15.45. *Utamur ergo etiam hereticis non ut eorum approbemus errores, sed ut catholicam disciplinam adversus eorum insidias adserentes vigilantiores et cautiores simus, etiamsi eos ad salutem revocare non possumus.*

[13] *vera rel.* V.8.25. *Quod si hoc unum tantum vitium christiana disciplina sanatum videremus, ineffabili laude praedicandam esse neminem negare oporteret.* 26. *Hereses namque tam innumerabiles a regula Christianitatis aversae testes sunt...* VI.10.30. *Haec enim ecclesia catholica per totum orbem valide lateque diffusa omnibus errantibus utitur ad provectus suos..*, VII.12.37. *...tenenda est nobis christiana religio et eius ecclesiae communicatio quae catholica est et catholica nominatur non solum a suis, verum etiam ab omnibus inimicis.*

[14] Cf. *vera rel.* I.1.1. *...qua unus deus colitur...* Nach Du Roy 1966, 67, Anm. 2 wendet sich Augustin damit auch gegen Porphyr, der sich herablassend über die materielle Seite des *cultus* geäußert und gegenüber der Vielheit der *religiones* eine relativistische Auffassung vertreten habe. In *vera rel.* setzt er dagegen die Auffassung, es müsse eine wahre *religio* für alle geben und diese bestehe darin, den einen Gott zu verehren. Vgl. Feil 1986, 42. Zum Begriff des Kultus bei Augustin s. Kobusch, Th., *Das Christentum als die Religion der Wahrheit. Überlegungen zu Augustins Begriff des Kultus*, in: RÉAug 29(1983) 97-128.

[15] Bezeichnend ist, daß auch Cicero den *cultus* in einer Schrift mit dem Titel *De natura deorum* behandelt. Das fiel auch Smith 1991, 22 auf: »Cicero...is concerned not with religion as a phenomenon but with the gods«. Vgl. Feil 1986, 40. Zum Einfluß dieser Tendenz auf Augustin s. Mayer, C. P., *»Pietas« und »vera pietas quae caritas est«. Zwei Kernfragen der Auseinandersetzung Augustins mit der heidnischen Antike*, in: *Augustiniana traiectina, ÉAug*, Paris 1987, 119-136. Testard, M., *Saint Augustin et Cicéron*, Paris 1958, Bd.1, 46. 72-75.

[16] *vera rel.* LV.112.307. *Quibus similes vel etiam mundiores atque sanctiores si sunt boni angeli et omnia sancta dei ministeria, quid metuimus ne aliquem illorum offendamus, si non superstitiosi fuerimus, cum ipsis adiuvantibus ad unum deum tendentes et ei uni religantes animas nostras — unde religio dicta creditur — omni superstitione careamus?*

[17] *ord.* II.18.47. *Excipit enim hanc eruditionem iam ipsa philosophiae disciplina, et in ea nihil plus invenit quam quid sit unum, sed longe altius longeque divinius. Cuius duplex quaestio est: una de anima, altera de deo.* CCSL 29, 133. Vgl. *vera rel.* V.8.26. *...non aliam esse philosophiam, id est sapientiae studium, et aliam religionem...*

[18] Feil 1986, 72. *vera rel.* LV.113.310. In *retr.* wird auch das ciceronische *eligere, auswählen*, als Etymologon für *religere* angegeben, zu dem Augustin in *civ.* zurückgekehrt war, nachdem er in *vera rel.* von *religare, rückbinden*, ausgegangen war. Auch ein Bezug zu *traditio, Überlieferung* der Lehre (objektiv) und *sich Ausliefern* an den Kern der Überlieferung (subjektiv), ließe sich herstellen. Allerdings findet sich in *vera rel.* nur das Verb (und nur in der objektiven Bedeutung): III.5.18. *si tali pollicitationi atque sponsioni per omnes terrarum partes quas homines incolunt sacra christiana traduntur...* XXVI.48.130. *Dispensatio ergo temporalis et medicina divinae providentiae erga eos qui peccato mortalitatem meruerunt, sic traditur.* Die Begriffe *Einheit* und *Allmacht* Gottes verweisen auch schon auf die Problematik der [neo-] platonischen Gotteslehre, wie Augustin sie gekannt und in sein Denken integriert hat, im Zusammenhang mit der biblisch-christlichen. Dazu: Barion, J., *Plotin und Augustinus. Untersuchungen zum Gottesproblem*, Berlin 1935. Dahl, A., *Augustin und Plotin. Philosophische Untersuchungen zum Trinitätsproblem und zur Nuslehre*, Lund 1945.

[19] *vera rel.* XXXV.65.182. *Unum certe quaerimus quo simplicius nihil est. Ergo in simplicitate cordis quaeramus illum. »Agite otium«, inquit, »et agnoscetis quia sum dominus«...*

[20] *vera rel.* VII.12.37. *tenenda est nobis christiana religio.* X.19.55. *Ea est nostris temporibus christiana religio.*

[21] *retr.* I.13(12).1. *Tunc etiam de vera religione librum scripsi, in quo multipliciter et copiosissime disputatur unum verum deum, id est trinitatem, patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum, religione vera colendum, et quanta misericordia eius per temporalem dispensationem concessa sit hominibus Christiana religio, quae vera religio est, et ad eundem cultum dei quemadmodum sit homo quadam suavitate coaptandus.* 3. *Item quod dixi: Ea est nostris temporibus Christiana religio, quam cognoscere ac sequi securissima et certissima salus est, secundum hoc nomen dictum est non secundum ipsam rem, cuius hoc nomen est. Nam res ipsa, quae nunc Christiana religio nuncupatur, erat et apud antiquos nec defuit ab initio generis humani, quousque Christus veniret in carne, unde vera religio, quae iam erat, coepit appellari Christiana.* CCSL 57, 36f. *vera rel.* LV.113.312. *...principium ad quod recurrimus et formam quam sequimur et gratiam qua reconciliamur; unum quo auctore conditi sumus, et similitudinem eius per quam ad unitatem formamur et pacem qua unitati adhaeremus...*

[22] Dies gilt nach Feil auch für die christlichen Väter vor Augustin: »*Religio* war kein Terminus, der schon in der Patristik ebenbürtig mit *fides* gewesen wäre«. Feil 1986, 79. Dagegen spricht allerdings, daß, im Dialog mit Cicero, schon Laktanz zwischen *religio* im Allgemeinen (d.h. der Heiden) als *deos colere* und *religio vera* der Christen als *uni et vero deo supplicare* unterschied, eine Überlegung, auf die Augustin in *vera rel.* weiter aufbauen konnte. Dazu auch Smith 1991, 28: »Early Western civilization was on the verge, at the time of Lactantius, of taking a decisive step in the formulation of an elaborate, comprehensive, philosophic concept of *religio*«.

[23] *vera rel.* I.1.1.-VI.11.35.

[24] *vera rel.* I.1.1. *...hinc evidentius error deprehenditur eorum populorum qui multos deos colere quam unum verum deum et dominum omnium maluerunt, quod eorum sapientes, quos philosophos vocant, scholas habebant dissentientes et templa communia.* 2. *Non enim vel populos vel sacerdotes latebat de ipsorum deorum natura quam diversa sentirent...*

[25] *vera rel.* II.2.4. *Socrates tamen audacior ceteris...*

[26] *vera rel.* I.1.3. *...aliud eos in religione suscepisse cum populo et aliud eodem ipso populo audiente defendisse privatim.* II.2.7. *...post eius [Socratis] damnationem mortemque nemo ausus est iurare per canem nec appellare quemcumque lapidem Iovem, sed haec tantummodo memoriae litterisque mandare...*

[27] Dadurch, daß sie in der Kirche weitertradiert wird: *vera rel.* III.3.8. *Illud tamen fidentissime dixerim pace horum omnium qui eorum libros pervicaciter diligunt, Christianis temporibus quaenam religio potissimum tenenda sit et quae ad veritatem ac beatitudinem via, non esse dubitandum.*

[28] *vera rel.* III.3.8. *Si enim Plato ipse viveret...*

[29] *vera rel.* III.3.8.

[30] *vera rel.* III.3.11.

[31] *vera rel.* III.4.14.

[32] *vera rel.* V.8.26. *...non aliam esse philosophiam, id est sapientiae studium, et aliam religionem...*

[33] Auch nicht in biographischer Hinsicht! Augustins erste literarische Gehversuche bestanden in einer Schrift mit dem Titel *De pulchro et apto.* S. dazu Testard 1958, Bd. 1, 49ff.

[34] Dabei werden folgende Abstufungen vorgenommen:

1. Höchste, geistige Schönheit, die identisch ist mit der aktiven Schöpferkraft Gottes und ihrer Abbildung im menschlichen Geist: XXII.42.115. *ars ipsa, qua versus fabricatur...extrema vestigia illius pulchritudinis ostentat quam constanter atque incommutabiliter ars ipsa custodit.* XXIX.52.143. *Non enim frustra et inaniter intueri oportet pulchritudinem caeli...* XXXIII.61.175. *ad contemplandam summam pulchritudinem mens, non oculus factus est...* XXXIX.72.201. *Quid igitur restat unde non possit anima recordari primam pulchritudinem...* XLIII.80.229. *totumque istum mundum figurarum ratione pulchrum esse, non mole...*

2. Schönheit der zeitlichen, geschöpflichen Ordnung in ihrem ursprünglichen Zustand: XXI.41.113. *temporalium formarum numerum in unam pulchritudinem* complent...XLI.77.216. *nihil enim est ordinatum quod non sit pulchrum...*XLIII.80.231. *ordinata convenientia pulchra iudicetur.*

3. Schönheit sogar noch der gefallenen und gerichteten Schöpfung im Rahmen der Schönheit des im Gericht gerichteten Ganzen: XV.29.79. *iustitiae pulchritudo* XL.74.208.

[exterior homo] *in proprio tamen genere pulchrum*...XL.75.210. *voluptatis regnum et ima pulchritudo* 76.213. *Ita ordinantur omnes officiis et finibus suis in pulchritudinem universitatis*... XL.76.214. *Verum enim nostrum iudicium, sive de toto sive de parte iudicet, pulchrum est.* XLI.77.216. *homo exterior...defectu autem suo in pulchritudines corruptibiliores, id est poenarum ordinem praecipitatur. Nec miremur quod adhuc pulchritudines nomino*...XXIII.44.120. ...est *pulchritudo universae creaturae per haec tria inculpabilis: damnatione peccatorum, exercitatione iustorum, perfectione beatorum.*

Vgl. dazu *de musica* VI.25: ...*aspice in vim potentiamque rationis, quantum ex operibus eius aspicere possumus. Ipsa enim, ut id potissimum dicam quod ad huius operis susceptionem attinet, primo quid sit ipsa bona modulatio consideravit, et eam in quodam motu libero, et ad suae pulchritudinis finem converso esse perspexit.* Vgl. Holl, K., *Augustins innere Entwicklung*, in: Ders., *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte* III, Tübingen 1928, 54-116, bes. 75. Horn, H.-J., *Lügt die Kunst? ... Ein kunsttheoretischer Gedankengang*, in: *JAC* 22(1979) 55-60. Rief, J., *Der ordo-Begriff des jungen Augustin*, Paderborn 1962.

[35] *vera rel.* V.9.28. *Iudaei vero quamvis uni omnipotenti deo supplicent, sola tamen temporalia et visibilia bona de illo expectantes rudimenta novi populi ab humilitate surgentia in ipsis suis scripturis nimia securitate noluerunt advertere...* VI.10.30. ...*ecclesia catholica...utitur...Iudaeis ad comparationem pulchritudinis suae.* Dem Schönen der platonischen Ästhetik entspricht übrigens das Gute im Bereich der Ethik, die nach Augustin im alttestamentlichen Glauben in gleicher Weise nicht im Geist verankert ist, sondern bei seiner Gesetzlichkeit eben im Fleisch: *vera rel.* XV.29.79. *iustitiae pulchritudo* XVII.33.89. *Nunc vero quoniam pietas timore inchoatur, caritate perficitur, populus timore constrictus tempore servitutis in vetere lege multis sacramentis onerabatur. Hoc enim utile talibus erat ad desiderandam gratiam dei, quae per prophetas ventura canebatur. Quae ubi venit ab ipsa dei sapientia homine adsumpto et in libertatem vocati sumus, pauca sacramenta saluberrima constituta sunt, quae societatem christiani populi, hoc est sub uno deo liberae multitudinis continerent.*

[36] Vgl. *vera rel.* V.9.27-29.

[37] *vera rel.* V.9.29. *Quae cum ita sint, neque in confusione paganorum neque in purgamentis hereticorum neque in languore schismaticorum neque in caecitate Iudaeorum quaerenda religio est, sed apud eos solos qui Christiani catholici vel orthodoxi nominantur, id est integritatis custodes et recta sectantes.*

90409 *Nürnberg*, Virchowstr. 27

Vigiliae Christianae 47 (1993), 374-378, © E. J. Brill, Leiden

A DIATESSARON READING IN A LATIN MANICHEAN CODEX

BY

GILLES QUISPEL

The Latin parchment codex found near Tebessa in Algeria in 1918 and preserved in the *Bibliothèque Nationale* at Paris (*Nouvelles acquisitions latines* 1114) is the only Manichean document in Latin discovered to this date. It tries to show that the Manichean hierarchy of *electi* and *auditores* is based upon the teachings of Jesus and Paul. It has been suggested that its author was Mani himself[1]; in that case the original language must have been Aramaic ("Syriac"). But it is also quite possible that this treatise was the work of Addai (Adimantus), the missionary of Mani to the West and a gifted adept of higher criticism, whose polemics against Catholicism are known to us through the intermediation of the book which Augustine wrote against him. In that case the original language may have been Greek. The excavations at Kellis have shown that a Manichean literature in Greek did exist in antiquity. It is not even completely to be excluded that it was an African Manichean who wrote this work. But that is not very probable because no other specimens of the kind are known, except the lost treatise of Augustine called: *De pulchro et apto*, summarised in *Confessiones* IV, 24, and Augustine's quotations from Faustus. Whatever may be the case, it is quite sure that the book contained in this codex was written by a Manichean who was a very able polemicist and knew the teachings of Jesus and his apostle Paul very well.

In column 9 of folio III, 1 this text reports about the wandering, poor and ascetic *electi* of the Gnostic Christian Church, which we call Manicheism, in terms derived from the Gospel:

nunc	
et opibus pauperes et	(now destitute of riches and
numero pauci et per	few in number
artam viam incedunt	they walk on the strait way
et angusto tramiti	and are bound on the narrow path).
destinati sunt.	

This passage, of course, refers to Matthew 7:14, which in the so-called "standard edition" of Kurt Aland (= Nestle 26th edition) runs as follows:

τί στενὴ ἡ πύλη καὶ τεθλιμμένη ἡ ὁδὸς
ἡ ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ζωὴν
καὶ ὀλίγοι εἰσὶν οἱ εὑρίσκοντες αὐτήν.
(How strait is *the gate* and narrow is the
way which leadeth unto life
and few there be *that find it.*)

The omission of ἡ πύλη in this verse is quite common. The "standard edition" cites *ad calcem paginae* the Afra Codex Bobbiensis (k) and the Itala codex a, Cyprian, who almost always agrees with the Bobbiensis, Tertullian in Carthage and Hippolytus in Rome as well as Clement of Alexandria and Origen (partim). Oldfashioned textcritics would call this a typically Western variant. To these witnesses should be added Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* 7, 7, 2, to which we will come back later. Here we only observe that this might possibly hint at some influence of the Jewish Christian Gospel tradition on the so-called Western text.[2] Aland chooses not to mention the parallel in the Pseudo-Clementine writing, because as a pupil of Hans Lietzmann he denies that such a thing as Jewish Christianity ever existed. We will return to this problem in a moment.

The variant *per artam viam incedunt* has no parallel whatsoever in any of the numerous Latin, Greek or Aramaic ("Syriac") manuscripts of the Gospel. It has a Semitic ring: 'Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly nor setteth foot in the way of sinners' (Psalm 1,1).

It is attested for the Diatessaron of Tatian, both in the East and in the West:

Persian (Messina 81,2)
e quanto pochi sono quelli che *vanno* per essa.
Tuscan (Vaccari 230,8):
e pochi sono coloro che *vanno* per essa.
Dutch Stuttgart (Bergsma 52):
ende lettel es dergere die daer in *gaen*.
Dutch Haaren (20,30):
(ende lettel) sijn der gheene die daer in *gaen*.
German Theodiscum (30,21):
und wenig ist der die dar in *gent*.

To these should be added another witness for the defense, the influential Aramaic (Syriac) mystic Makarios, who like so many of his countrymen wrote in Greek, but whose works reflect the colourful Christianity of Edessa and as such betray his knowledge not only of the Gospel of Thomas and the Gospel of the Nazoraeans, but also of Tatian's Gospel harmony:[3]

III, 16, 1, 78, 4: καὶ ὀλίγοι εἰσὶν *οἱ διοδεύοντες* αὐτήν.

Makarios lived in or around Edessa ± 350 A.D. If witnesses in the West and in the East agree on a reading, and it is not falsified by the Vulgate or the Peshitto, one can be quite sure that this variant goes back to Tatian himself.

Tatian did not invent it, but must have picked it up from the Jewish Christian Gospel tradition. In fact we find the verse of Matthew alluded to in the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*, 7,7,2, Rehm 119,21:

ἡ δὲ τῶν σῳζομένων στενὴ
σῴζουσα δὲ τοὺς διαπορευθέντας.

It would seem that this paraphrase implies both the variant στένη ὁδός and πορευθέντες δι' αὐτῆς, as we also find in the Codex from Tebessa.[4]

We may conclude then that the author of the writing transcribed in this codex, or his Latin translator, or both, knew and used the the Diatessaron of Tatian. He was not the only one. Again and again it has been shown in recent years that the Manicheans used this Gospel harmony.[5] And the reason why they did so becomes perfectly clear when we visualise the situation of Aramaic Christendom at the time of Mani. According to tradition it has been founded by the Judaic Christian Addai. When in about 170 Tatian returned to the East, his Diatessaron was accepted there unanimously. The first to use it was the author of the Acts of Thomas, who wrote his work in Edessa about 250 A.D. From then onwards Aramaic ("Syriac") Christian writers used the same book, right up to Philoxenos of Mabbug and "the humble Romanos", *the* poet of the Orthodox Church.[6]

There is no evidence whatsoever to prove that the four canonical Gospels were known in the East before Tatian. The existing Old Syriac versions, the *Syrus Sinaiticus* and the *Syrus Curetonianus*, are influenced by Tatian's writing and therefore much later. What other text of the Gospels could Mani have chosen, when he abandoned the Jewish commune in which he was reared?

Moreover, it is completely sure that Manicheans writing in Latin like the translator of Augustine's opponent Adimantius quote a very deviant version of the Diatessaron. He writes:

ibo primum ut sepeliam patrem meum (c. Ad. VI) instead of the normal Vulgate and Vetus Latina reading:

permitte mihi primum ire et sepelire patrem meum (Luke 9:59). The same is found in the Acts of Archelaus, which quotes Tatian's Gospel harmony in the following words:

ibo et sepeliam patrem meum (56,7).

The former Manichean Augustine seems to have read the Diatessaron in his wild and heretical youth. While he is extemporising, as he used to do in his sermons, the following slip of the tongue occurs:

Quid enim dicit? Ibo prius sepelire patrem meum.

Sermones 100,2.

The Greek of Augustine was poor, especially in his youth. As a Manichean he must have been familiar with a Latin translation of Tatian.[7]

From this and other indications we may safely conclude that the Manicheans of Africa knew and used the Diatessaron in a Latin translation. This is also suggested by the Codex from Tebessa.

No Catholic author writing in Latin of the first five centuries of the Christian era ever mentions the Diatessaron of Tatian. Could that be because this work was unknown in Catholic circles in the West? The first to do so was bishop Victor of Capua, who published his almost completely vulgatised version of it together with the more primitive *capitula* (summaries) in 547. This proves that a Latin archetype of the vernacular translations in Tuscan, Venetian, Old Saxon and Flemish did exist in the Middle Ages. Of course, this has been denied. As late as 1993 it has been proclaimed without any argumentation that in the Netherlands all the numerous versions in the vernacular dialects were based completely on the Vulgate, the authoritative Bible of the Church.[8] Is it really true that Zahn, Baumstark, Peters, Plooy and Peterson, in fact a whole regiment except one, are out of step? It is an established fact that there was once a Latin Diatessaron current in Africa and that it was transmitted by Manicheans.

Indeed, there is a serious possibility that the oldest translation of the Bible in Italy (the Tuscan and Venetian Diatessaron), in Germany (the Heliand)[9] and in the Netherlands (the Liège Diatessaron and related texts) are based upon this specific Manichean text. This would explain why these Western Harmonies offer so many important and interesting deviant readings which are absent from the Oriental tradition.

A commentator like Ephrem Syrus, a doctor of the Catholic Church,

and the faction to which he belonged, must have been worried about this extravagant text and certainly have felt the need to normalise it. The Manicheans could not have cared less.

NOTES

[1] R. Merkelbach, Der manichäische Codex von Tebessa, in Bryder, *Manichaean Studies*, Lund 1988, 233.

[2] J. van Amersfoort, The Gospel of Thomas and the Western Text, A Reappraisal,in *Gnostic Studies* II, Istanbul 1975, 56-69.

[3] The Gospel of Thomas revisited, in B. Barc, *Colloque international sur les textes de Nag Hammadi*, Louvain 1981, 251.

[4] Not relevant for our problem, though supposing the same variants are: Aristides, *Apology* 16; Clem. Al. *Strom.* IV, 22, 140; Eusebius, *Eclog. Proph.* III, 15.

[5] W.L. Petersen, An important unnoticed Diatessaronic reading in Turfan fragment M-18, in *Text and Testimony, Festschrift A.F.J. Klijn*, Kampen 1988, 187-199. H.J. Klimkeit, Apokryphe Evangelien in Zentral- und Ostasien, in Tongerloo-Giversen, *Manichaica Selecta*, Louvain 1991, 151.

[6] W.L. Petersen, *The Diatessaron and Ephrem Syrus as sources of Romanos the Melodist*, Louvain 1985.

[7] More on Augustine and the Manichean Diatesaron in *Tatian and the Gospel of Thomas*, Leiden 1975, 58-68.

[8] C.C. de Bruin, *De Statenbijbel en zijn voorgangers*, 2nd edition, Haarlem-Brussel 1993, 15.

[9] G. Murphy, *The Heliand*, the Saxon Gospel, New York-Oxford 1992; idem, *The Saxon Savior*, New York-Oxford 1989.

3722 BR *Bilthoven*, Noordhoudringelaan 32

Vigiliae Christianae 47 (1993), 379-389, © E. J. Brill, Leiden

SYNKELLOS' KALENDER DER HEBRÄER

VON

JÜRGEN TUBACH

In seiner Weltgeschichte, zumeist ἐκλογὴ χρονογραφίας genannt, berichtet der byzantinische Mönch und Chronist Georgios († ca. 810),[1] der unter Patriarch Tarasios (784-806) das Amt eines Synkellos (σύγκελλος)[2] bekleidete, von einem merkwürdigen Kalender, der einst »bei den« alten »Hebräern«[3] in Geltung gewesen sein soll, jedoch, wie ein Blick zeigt, aus den alttestamentlichen Schriften nicht ableitbar ist.

Synkellos führt den von ihm beschriebenen Kalender auf die »göttliche Gesetzgebung« (κατὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ νομοθεσίαν)[4] am Sinai[5] zurück. Auf die von ihm benutzten Quellen geht der gelehrte byzantinische Chronist nicht näher ein, sodaß völlig im Dunkeln bleibt, welchen Schriften er seine Informationen über den Kalender der »alten Hebräer« verdankte. Bei den eingangs zitierten »göttlich inspirierten Schriften«,[6] denen offenbar das kuriose Hebräerjahr bekannt war,[7] scheint Synkellos vornehmlich an das Alte Testament gedacht zu haben, obgleich dort an keiner Stelle ein bestimmter Kalender als verpflichtend vorgeschrieben wird.

Synkellos synchronisiert den Kalender der »Hebräer« mit dem römischen und ägyptischen, die sich jedoch vom ersteren nur hinsichtlich ihres inneren Aufbaus unterscheiden.[8] Das »hebräische« Jahr ist wie das römische und ägyptische ein Sonnenjahr zu 365 Tagen und in 4 Jahreszeiten zu je 3 Monaten eingeteilt. Abgesehen von der Synchronisierung mit dem julianischen und dem alexandrinischen Kalender vermerkt Synkellos die Monatslänge und gibt den jeweiligen »hebräischen« Monatsnamen an:

> »Der erste Monat nach der göttlichen Gesetzgebung bei den Hebräern, der Nisan, hat 30 Volltage[9] (und reicht) vom 25. März bis zum 23. April (bzw.) vom 29. Phamenoth bis zum 28. Pharmuthi. Der zweite Monat, Iares, hat 30 Tage (und reicht) vom 24. April bis zum 23. Mai (bzw.) von 29. Pharmuthi bis zum 28. des Monats Pachon. Der Monat Souian hat 31 Tage (und reicht) vom 24. Mai bis zum 23. Juni — insgesamt also 92 (Tage)[10]

— (bzw.) vom 29. Pachom bis zum 29. Payni. Sommersonnwende. Der Monat Thamni hat 30 Volltage (und reicht) vom 24. Juni bis zum 23. Juli (bzw.) vom 30. Payni bis 29. Epiphi. Der 5. Monat Arei hat 30 Tage (und reicht) vom 24. Juli bis zum 22. August (bzw.) vom 30. Epiphi bis zum 29. Mesori. Der 6. Monat Eilou hat 31 Tage (und reicht) vom 23. August bis zum 22. September — insgesamt also 182 Tage — (bzw.) vom 30. Mesori einschließlich der Epagomenen entsprechend dem 24. bis 28. August bis zum 25. Thoth. Herbst. Der 7. Monat Theeleiph hat 30 Tage (und reicht) vom 23. September bis zum 22. Oktober (bzw.) vom 26. Thoth, dem ersten Monat bei den Ägyptern, bis zum 25. Phaophi. Der 8. Monat Mersouan hat 30 Volltage (und reicht) vom 23. Oktober bis zum 21. November (bzw.) vom 26. Phaophi bis zum 25. Athyr. Der 9. Monat Chassaleu hat 31 Tage, insgesamt (jetzt) 273 (Tage), (und reicht) vom 22. November bis zum 22. Dezember (bzw.) vom 26. Athyr bis zum 26. Choiak. Wintersonnwende. Der 10. Monat Tebeth hat 30 Tage (und reicht) vom 23. Dezember bis zum 21. Januar (bzw.) vom 27. Choiak bis zum 26. Tybi. Der 11. Monat Sabbat hat 30 Tage (und reicht) vom 22. Januar bis zum 20. Februar (bzw.) vom 27. Tybi bis zum 26. Mechir. Der 12. Monat Adar hat 32 Tage (und reicht) vom 21. Februar[11] bis zum 24. März (bzw.) vom 27. Mechir bis zum 28. Phamenoth«.

Nach Synkellos' Angaben hat der 365-tägige Kalender der »Hebräer« 4 Quartale mit 91 bzw. 92 Tagen. Die ersten Quartale besitzen 30-30-31 Tage, das letzte 30-30-32 Tage. Mit dem julianischen und alexandrinischen Kalender synchronisiert läßt sich folgende Tabelle aufstellen (S.381):

Synkellos' Hebräerkalender ist in 4 Quartale von gleicher Länge,[12] den sogenannten astronomischen Jahreszeiten, eingeteilt, die sich am Lauf der Sonne durch die Ekliptik orientieren. Da die Sonne auf ihrer Bahn durch den in 360 Grad eingeteilten Zodiakos keine konstante Geschwindigkeit einhält, sind die zeitlichen Intervalle zwischen den Kardinalpunkten in Wirklichkeit nicht identisch, was den griechischen Astronomen aus empirischen Beobachtungen schon früh bekannt war. Da der Jahresanfang auf den 25. März fällt, ein Termin, der in der Antike (neben dem 24. März) häufig als Zeitpunkt des Frühlingsäquinoktiums angesehen wird,[13] liegt es nahe, die Quartalsanfänge mit den Kardinalpunkten des Sonnenlaufes gleichzusetzen. Im Sinne eines terminus technicus gebraucht Synkellos bzw. seine Quelle allerdings nur die Bezeichnungen für die Solstitien, ohne daß aus dem Text ansonsten eindeutig hervorginge, ob sich die betreffenden Worte für die Sommer- oder Wintersonnwende auf den letzten Tag eines Quartals oder auf den folgenden den nächsten beziehen.

Die Namen der einzelnen Monate stimmen abgesehen von zwei Aus-

Monat	Monatsname	Tageszahl	Julianischer Kalender	Alexandrinischer Kalender
[Frühling (ἔαρ)][1]				
1.	Nisan	30	25. März-23. April	29. Phamenoth-28. Pharmuthi
2.	Iares	30	24. April-23. Mai	29. Pharmuthi-28. Pachom
[3.]	Souian	31	24. Mai-23. Juni	29. Pachom-29. Payni
		Tagesume 92 (Zwischenbilanz)		
Sommersonnwende (θερινὴ τροπή)				
[4.]	Thamni	30	24. Juni-23. Juli	30. Payni-29. Epiphi
5.	Arei	30	24. Juli-22. August	30. Epiphi-29. Mesori
6.	Eilou	31	23. August-22. September	30. Mesori-25. Thoth (die 5 Epagomenen folgen auf den Monat Mesori = 24.-28. August 1. Thoth = Jahresanfang = 29. August)
		Tagessume 182 (Zwischenbilanz)		
Herbst (φθινόπωρον)				
7.	Theeleiph	30	23. September-22. Oktober	26. Thoth-25. Phaophi
8.	Mersouan	30	23. Oktober-21. November	26. Phaophi-25. Athyr
9.	Chasaleu	31	22. November-22. Dezember	26. Athyr-26. Choiak
		Tagessume 273 (Zwischenbilanz)		
Wintersonnwende (χειμερινὴ τροπή)				
10.	Tebeth	30	23. Dezember-21. Januar	27. Choiak-26. Tybi
11.	Sabbat	30	22. Januar-20. Februar	27. Tybi-26. Mechir
12.	Adar	32	21. Februar-24. März	27. Mechir-28. Phamenoth
	Endsume der Tage pro Jahr	[ ]		

1) Angaben in eckiger Klammer fehlen im griechischen Text

nahmen mit den seit dem Exil gebräuchlichen termini babylonischer Provenienz überein. Die Transkription der semitischen Worte ist zum Teil leicht entstellt, kann aber problemlos korrigiert werden. Aus dem Rahmen fallen lediglich der 5. und der 7. Monat, deren Namen anscheinend lokale Varianten darstellen:

Synkellos	Septuaginta Josephus[15]	Altes Testament Mischna[16]	akkadische Namensform[14]
Nisan (var. Nissan)	Nisan	Nīan	Nisannu
Iares	Iar[17]	'Iyyār	Aj(j)aru
Souian[18]	Siouan	Sīwān[19]	Simanu
Thamni (var. Thamnei[20])	(Thammouz, Hes.8_{14})	Tammūz	Du'ūzu (*Tammūzu[21])
Arei[22] (m:'Ab)	Aba	'Ab	[Abu]
Eilou (m:Eloul)	Eloul	Älul	Elūlu, Ulūlu
Theeleiph[23]	[Thisri]	[Tišrī]	[Tašrītu]
Mersouan	Marsouanes	Marḥäswān[24]	Araḫsamna
Chassaleu	Chaseleu	Kislew	Kislīmu
Tebeth (var. Tubeth, Tubi)	Tebethos	Ṭēbēt	Ṭebētu/Kinūnu
Sabbat	Sabat	Šbāṭ	Šabaṭu
Adar	Adar	'Ădar/Addar	Addaru

Obgleich die Reihenfolge und die Monatsnamen von Synkellos' Hebräerjahr mit dem offiziellen jüdischen Kalender, einem Ableger des babylonischen Kalenders, der spätestens seit der Achämenidenzeit im syro-palästinischen Raum verbreitet war, weitgehend übereinstimmt, gibt es einen tiefgreifenden Unterschied. Im Gegensatz zum jüdischen Lunisolarkalender, in dem das 354-tägige Mondjahr[25] nach einen bestimmten Interkalationsmodus dem tropischen Sonnenjahr angeglichen wird,[26] ist der Hebräerkalender des Synkellos ein reines Sonnenjahr,[27] in dem der Mond seine Funktion als Zeitmesser völlig verloren hat. Da Synkellos über Julius Africanus (ca. 200 n.Chr.)[28] bzw. Euseb (ca. 339/40)[29] bekannt war, daß der jüdische Kalender nach dem luniso-

laren und nicht nach dem solaren Prinzip aufgebaut war, stellt sich natürlich die naheliegende Frage, welcher Quelle er den eigentümlichen Sonnenkalender der »Hebräer« letztlich entnommen hat, zumal er der alttestamentlichen Tradition fremd ist. Die Lösung des Rätsels ist jedoch nicht so einfach, wie es zunächst erscheint. Verkürzt man den letzten Monat des »hebräischen« Kalenders um einen Tag, erhält man 4 Quartale zu je 91 Tagen (30-30-31) d.h. einen Kalendertyp, der exakt der im Henoch-[30] und Jubiläenbuch[31] propagierten idealen Zeitrechnung entspricht. Von diesen beiden einst sehr beliebten Pseudepigraphen war Synkellos vermutlich keines mehr im Original zugänglich.[32] Wie andere byzantinische Chronographen kannte er das Henoch- und Jubiläenbuch, deren Wert nicht übermäßig hoch geschätzt wurde, nur aus Zitaten und Inhaltsangaben[33] der älteren Sekundärliteratur. Der bereits in der Antike hoffnungslos veraltete astronomische Teil des Henochbuches, in dem der Aufbau des 364-tägigen Kalenders beschrieben wird, lag Synkellos mit Sicherheit nicht vor.[34]

Obgleich der äußere Rahmen, in den der »Hebräerkalender« eingebettet ist — Verknüpfung mit der Schöpfung und der Sinaioffenbarung — mit der Konzeption des Jubiläenbuches übereinstimmt, muß Synkellos eine Quelle benutzt haben, die sich von Jub Kap. 6 in zwei wesentlichen Merkmalen underschied: Im Gegensatz zu dem von Hen und Jub propagierten und von den Essenern rezipierten Solarkalender tragen die einzelnen Monate bei Synkellos Namen und werden nicht einfach durchgezählt. Statt 364 Tage hat das Sonnenjahr wie auch sonst üblich 365 Tage.[35] Die Verwendung der babylonischen Monatsnamen und die Einführung eines 365. Tages sprechen gegen die direkte Benutzung des Jubiläenbuches als Quelle für den Kalender der »alten Hebräer«. Außerdem verrät Synkellos' Darstellung der Sintflut keinen unmittelbaren Einfluß durch das chronologische Gerüst von Jub 6[36] für die Dauer der Flut, deren markante Stationen durch die Kardinalpunkte des Sonnenlaufes strukturiert sind. Aus den beiden Monatsnamen, die sich nicht mit den offiziel benutzten decken, kann ähnlich wie im Fall des heliopolitanischen Kalenders[37] der Schluß gezogen werden, daß eine lokale Variante der ansonsten gebräuchlichen Namen vorliegt. Was für die Namen gilt, muß jedoch nicht für den Aufbau des Kalenders gelten. Von den Stadtkalendern des palästinisch-syrischen Raumes liefert der Struktur nach nur der Kalender von Heliopolis-Baalbek eine, wenn auch enge, Parallele.[38] Als Vorlage für Synkellos' »Hebräerkalender« scheidet er aber aus mancherlei Gründen aus.[39] Da eine unmittelbare Ablei-

tung des 365-tägigen Solarkalenders aus dem Jubiläenbuch ausgeschlossen ist und eine Anlehnung an den heliopolitanischen Kalender nicht in Frage kommt, muß Synkellos (bzw. Panodoros, Annianos oder bereits Julius Africanus) als Zwischenstufe eine Quelle benutzt haben, die den Jubiläenkalender in manchen Punkten modifizierte und präzisierte, indem sie dem letzten Kalendermonat einen 32. Tag hinzufügte, sodaß das Jahr explizit 365 Tage hatte, in dem die Monate nicht mehr mit den Ordinalia durchgezählt wurden, sondern Namen erhielten, die einem lokalen jüdischen Kalender entnommen sind. Diese Modifikation des Henoch/Jubiläenkalenders kann ursprünglich in einer ansonsten unbekannten Schrift gestanden haben, die die Sinaioffenbarung mit einer gottgewollten idealen Zeitrechnung nach dem Vorbild des Jubiläenbuches kombinierte und die über Julius Africanus oder Panodoros in die Weltchronik des Synkellos gelangte, wo bereits als selbstverständlich angenommen wird, daß dieser Kalender einst bei den »Hebräern« galt. Nicht ausgeschlossen wäre natürlich, daß Julius Africanus, der aus Jerusalem stammte und mit jüdischer Kultur vertraut war, den 364-tägigen Kalender den Umständen entsprechend verbesserte und Monatsnamen, wie sie irgendwo im jüdischen Palästina üblich waren, einführte.

Notes

[1] Zu Leben und Werk vgl. den Lexikonartikel von Laqueur, sowie Gelzer (II 176-249), Hunger (I 1978:331f), Huxley (1981:207-217) und Adler (1989:4-8.132ff u.ö.)

[2] Mönche, die mit einem höheren Geistlichen, z.B. einem Bischof oder dem Patriarchen, die Cella teilten, wurden synkelloi genannt. Der Patriarch besaß gleich mehrere »Zellgenossen« (Laqueur 1932:1388, Beck 1959:68f. 102 u.ö., Ders. 1980:268). Der Synkellos ist ein enger Vertrauter und Sekretär des Bischof oder des Patriarchen.

[3] Dindorf 607_{12}/Mosshammer 389_{14}.

[4] Dindorf 11_{8}/Mosshammer 6_{25}.

[5] Das Stichtwort Sinai fällt zwar nicht, muß aber dem Kontext nach ergänzt werden, da νομοθεσία mit Sicherheit auf die Sinaigesetzgebung anspielt.

[6] Dindorf 1_{7}/Mosshammer 1_{12}.

[7] Die Notiz, daß der erste Monat »bei den Hebräern und den göttlich inspirierten Schriften« den Namen Nisan trage, impliziert nicht eo ipso, daß der beschriebene Kalender den gleichen Quellen entnommen ist.

[8] Beschreibung des Kalenders: Dindorf 11_{8}-13_{11}/Mosshammer 6_{25}-7_{23}.

[9] νυχθήμερον Nacht und Tag = Volltag (von 24 Stunden).

[10] Vgl. Mosshammer 6 Apparat. Diese Angabe ist nur sinnvoll, wenn der Neujahrstag eine Sonderstellung einnimmt und dem ersten Quartal zugerechnet wird (Neujahrs-

tag + 4 × 30-30-31 Tage). 92 Tage hat nach Synkellos' Beschreibung das 4. Quartal des Jahres, wo der letzte Monat des Jahres statt 31 Tage 32 zählt.

[11] Analog zu anderen Jahreszeiten müßte hier die entsprechende Angabe über die Zahl der Tage pro Kalenderjahr stehen, die bisher verstrichen sind.

[12] Nur das 4. Quartal hat im Prinzip 92 Tage.

[13] Vgl. die Tabelle bei Boll (1911:30).

[14] Borger (⁴1988:66f Nr. 52), McEwan (1981:178-181 u.ö.), Kaufman (1974:114f)

[15] Belege bei Schürer I 745f.

[16] dsgl.

[17] Ohne die griechische Endung -es kommt der Monatsname fast in der gleichen Schreibung (ειαρ, wohl ἰάρ zu lesen, Var. ιαραρ) im Kalender der Stadt Heliopolis-Baalbek vor (Kubitschek 1915:14.33.47.48.100.113).

[18] Es empfiehlt sich die handschriftlich belegte Form entsprechend der Transkription von grBar 1_8, die genau das hebräische bzw. aramäische Wortbild wiedergibt, durch einen minimalen Eingriff abzuändern.

[19] Die Orthographie spiegelt die Aussprache des neu- und spätbabylonischen intervokalischen m als w wieder (Kaufman 1974:119.143).

[20] Die Variante ist wegen der itazistischen Aussprache belanglos. Der Monatsname muß ein aus Thammouz entstandenes Koruptel sein. Zur exakten Transkription des semitischen Namens vgl. den entsprechenden Monat des heliopolitanischen Kalenders nach dem Leidener Kalenderbuch (Kubitschek 1915:19.100.113).

[21] Zur der rekonstruierten Form vgl. Kaufman (1974:115).

[22] Von hebräisch ḥōri (חֳרִי) »Hitze, Glut« (KBL² 333/KBL³ 339) abgeleiter, ergäbe sich für den zunächst ungewöhnlichen Monatsnamen ein durchaus passabler Sinn. Der am 24. Juli beginnende Monat wäre nach der unerträglichen »Gluthitze« der Jahreszeit benannt.

[23] Der östlichen Kalendertradition ist ein derartiger Monatsname fremd. Die mit der griechischen Orthographie nicht konforme Verdoppelung des Epsilon weist darauf hin, daß in der Umschrift des semitischen Originals ein Guttural ausgefallen ist.

[24] Zur Entstehung der aramäischen/hebräischen Form vgl. Kaufman (1974:115 Anm.418).

[25] Die Monate haben alternierend 29 oder 30 Tage.

[26] Zur Interkalation, die anfangs empirisch, später nach dem 19-jährigen Zyklus erfolgte vgl. Schürer (I 747-754/engl. Neuausg. I 587-601), Strobel (1977:430-440), sowie auch Wacholder-Weisberg (1971:227-242 = 1976:59-74).

[27] Einen vom Aufbau des ägyptischen Wandeljahres abhängigen Kalender besaßen in Palästina bzw. Syrien nur Gaza, Askalon und Bostra (Samuel 1972:177). Weder julianischem noch ägyptischem Vorbild sind die Stadtkalender von Tyros und Baalbek-Heliopolis verpflichtet (Samuel 1072:172).

[28] Dindorf I 611_{10ff}/Mosshammer 392_{10ff}. Julius war der erste Christ, der eine Weltchronik verfaßte (vgl. Crehan 1977:635-640 bes. 636f). Er zählt neben Euseb und dem alexandrinischen Mönch Panodoros (ca. 400) zu den grundlegenden Autoren, deren Chronographie Synkellos eingehend studierte, die aber im Original nicht erhalten sind (Karst 1911 und Adler 1989 passim).

[29] Demonstratio evangelica VIII $2_{46.130}$ (ed. I.A. Heikel: GCS 6, 1913, 374.391), vgl. dazu Schürer (I 751).

[30] äthHen 72_{32}. 8_{11}, Kardinalpunkte = Zusatztage am Quartalende: $72_{3ff.35}$, 75_{1f}, $82_{4.6.11}$. Zum Solarkalender und den astronomischen Vorstellungen von äthHen 72-82

vgl. bes. Neugebauer (1964:49-71 = 1983:467-489), Ders. (1979) und (1981 = Black 1985:386-419).

[31] Jub 6_{30-32}, 6_{23-29}. Der Henoch- wie der Jubiläenkalender beginnen mit dem Frühlingsäquinoktium. Den gleichen Kalendertyp benutzte auch die Qumran-Gemeinschaft (Talmon ^{2}1965:162-199 = 1988:152-189, Ben-Shahar 1975, Strobel 1977:440ff, Yadin 1983:89-136.407f bes. 116-119, Maier 1985:70-76 = 1978:76-83, VanderKam 1987:211-236).

[32] Gelzer (II 262), Adler (1989:148.178.182f.187f. u.ö.).

[33] Zu den Exzerpten aus dem Jub, in der Regel keine wörtlichen Textzitate, sondern Inhaltsangaben vgl. Charles (1895:5.7.9) und bes. Denis (1970:70-102), sowie noch Rönsch (1874 = 1970:278-302), Charles (1902 = 1971/2 = 1984:LXXVII-LXXXIII), Milik (1971:545-557), Gelzer (II 249ff.276ff), Adler (1989:182ff u.ö.). Zu den Exzerpten aus dem 1. Teil des Henochkorpus, zumeist wörtliche Zitate, vgl. Black (1970:21-30.37), Gelzer (II 250.262ff), Adler (1989:175ff).

[34] Einmal spielt Synkellos auf den im äthHen 72-73 beschriebenen Lauf der Sonne und die damit implizierte Zeitrechnung an (Dindorf 60_{17}/Mosshammer 34_{18}, vgl. Adler 1989:178).

[35] Ohne Zweifel wurde alle vier Jahre wie im festen alexandrinischen Kalender oder im julianischen ein 366. Tag eingeschoben, um eine Rotation des Jahresanfangs zu verhindern. Im 364-tägigen Sonnenkalender ist die Interkalationsfrage nicht gelöst. Die einschlägigen Texte geben keine Auskunft, wie die Jahreslänge mit dem tropischen Sonnenjahr ausgeglichen wurde, weshalb nicht selten auch angenommen wird, daß eine Interkalation überhaupt nicht vorgesehen war (vgl. dazu Vf. demnächst).

[36] Rönsch (1874 = 1970:288f).

[37] Die Monate Gelon und Ag (< ḥagg Fest = Festmonat) kommen im babylonischen Kalender nicht vor und sind lokale Varianten, die die babylonischen Namen entweder verdrängten oder wegen ihrer kultischen Bedeutung nicht verdrängt werden konnten.

[38] Der heliopolitanische Kalender hat drei Quartale zu 91 Tagen (30-30-31) und ein Quartal mit 92 Tagen (30-31-31). Reduziert man den zweiten Monat des 92-tägigen Quartals um einen Tag, erhält man formal die Struktur des Henoch- und Jubiläenkalenders.

[39] Abgesehen von der Verteilung des 365. Tages, der naturgemäß die Symmetrie der Quartale sprengt, stimmen die Monatsnamen nicht überein. Insbesondere die Monate, deren Name einer Sondertradition folgt, sind vom terminus her und der Stellung im Kalender völlig verschieden. Außerdem ist der heliopolitanische Kalender in seiner Namengebung der aramäisch-syrischen Überlieferung verpflichtet und nicht der jüdischen (vgl. auch Kubitschek 1915:100.113).

Die Abkürzungen von Zeitschriften, Reihen etc. folgen dem von Siegfried Schwertner für die »Theologische Realenzyklopädie'' zusammengestellten »Abkürzungsverzeichnis« (1976). In die Bibliographie wurden Textausgaben abgesehen von Synkellos nicht aufgenommen.

William Adler, Time Immemorial. Archaic History and its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus (DOS 26) Washington 1989 — Hans-Georg Beck, Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich (HAW XII 2.1) München 1959.

²1977 — Ders., Geschichte der orthodoxen Kirche im byzantinischen Reich (KIG Lfg. D ᶜ) Göttingen 1980 — Ze'ev BEN-SHAHAR, The Calendar of the Judaean Desert Sect: Diss. Tel-Aviv University 1971 — M(atthew) BLACK, Apocalypsis Henochi Graece (PVTG 3) Leiden 1970 — Franz (Johannes) BOLL, Griechische Kalender II. Der Kalender der Quintilier und die Überlieferung der Geoponica: SHAW.PW (1911, 1. Abh.) — Rykle BORGER, Assyrisch-babylonische Zeichenliste von ... unter Mitarbeit von Friedrich Ellenmeier (AOAT 33) Kevelaer /Neukirchen-Vluyn 1978. ⁴1988 — Robert Henry CHARLES, Mashafa Kufale or the Ethiopic Version of the Hebrew Book of Jubilees otherwise known among the Greeks as ἡ λεπτὴ Γένεσις edited from four Manuscripts, and critically revised through a continuous comparison of the Massoretic and Samaritan Texts, and the Greek, Syriac, Vulgate and Ethiopic Versions of the Pentateuch, and further emended and restored in accordance with the Hebrew, Syriac and Latin Fragments of this Book, which are here published in full (Anecdota Oxoniensia II. Semitic Series 8) Oxford 1895 — DERS., The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis translated from the Editor's Ethiopic Text and edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices (London 1902. Repr. Jerusalem 1971/72. Repr. St.Clair Shores, Mich. 1984) — Joseph CREHAN, Africanus, Julius (ca. 160-240): TRE I (1977) 635-640 — Albert-Marie DENIS, Fragmenta Pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt graeca una cum historicorum et auctorum Judaeorum hellenistarum fragmentis collegit et ordinavit (PVTG 3) Leiden 1970 — (Karl) Wilhelm DINDORF, Georgius Syncellus et Nicephorus Cp. I.II (CSHB 20.21)Bonn 1829 — Heinrich (Karl Guido) GELZER, Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie I-III (Leipzig 1880.1885.1898 Repr. Hildesheim 1978 und Repr. New York ca 1967) — Herbert HUNGER, Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner I.II (HAW XII 5,1/2) München 1978 — Georg L(eonard) HUXLEY, On the erudition of George the Syncellos: PIA 81 (1981)207-217 — Josef KARST, Eusebius Werke V. Die Chronik aus dem Armenischen übersetzt mit textkritischem Commentar (GCS 20) Leipzig 1911 — Stephen A(llan) KAUFMAN, The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic (AS 19) Chicago 1974 — Wilhelm KUBITSCHEK, Die Kalenderbücher von Florenz, Rom und Leyden: DAWW. PH 57 Abh. 3 (1915) — (Richard) LAQUEUR, Synkellos (Nr.1): PRE IV A (1932) 1388-1410 — Johann MAIER, The Temple Scroll. An Introduction, Translation & Commentary (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series 34) Sheffield 1985 < Die Tempelrolle vom

Toten Meer. Übersetzt und erläutert (UTB 829) Basel 1978 — Gilbert J(oseph) P(aul) McEwan, Priest and Temple in Hellenistic Babylonia (Freiburger Altorientalische Studien 4) Wiesbaden 1981 — J(osef) T(adeusz) Milik, Recherches sur la version grecque du Livre des Jubiles: RB 78 (1971) 545-557 — Alden A(dams) Mosshammer, Georgii Syncelli ecloga chronographica (BSGRT) Leipzig 1984 — O(tto Eduard) Neugebauer, Notes on Ethiopic Astronomy: Or. 33 (1964) 49-71 = Ders., Astronomy and History. Selected Essays (New York-Berlin-Heidelberg-Tokyo 1983) 467-489 — Ders., Ethiopic Astronomy and computus: SÖAW.PH 347 (= Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Geschichte der Mathematik, Naturwissenschaften und Medizin H.22) Wien 1979 — Ders., The »Astronomical« Chapters of the Ethiopic Books of Enoch (72 to 82). Translation and Commentary by ... With Additional Notes on the Aramaic Fragments by Matthew Black: Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Matematisk-fysiske Meddelelser 40,1o (Kobenhavn 1981) = Matthew Black, The Book of Enoch or I Enoch. A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes by ... in Consultation with James C(laire) VanderKam, with an Appendix on the »Astronomical« Chapters (72-82) by Otto Neugebauer (SVTP 7) Leiden 1985, 386-419 — Hermann Rönsch, Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die Kleine Genesis. Unter Beifügung des revidirten Textes der in der Ambrosiana aufgefundenen lateinischen Fragmente sowie einer von August Dillmann aus zwei äthiopischen Handschriften gefertigten lateinischen Übertragung erläutert, untersucht und mit Unterstützung der königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen herausgegeben (Leipzig 1874. Repr. Amsterdam 1970) — Alan E(douard) Samuel, Greek and Roman Chronology. Calendars and Years in Classical Antiquity (HAW I 7) München 1972 — Emil Schürer, Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi I (^{3}.^{4}1901 Leipzig. Repr. Hildesheim 1964 und 1970/engl. Übs. Edinburgh 1885ff/1924)/Ders., The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135). A New English Version revised and edited by Geza Vermes & Fergus Millar. Literary Editor Pamela Vermes. Organizing Editor Matthew Black I (Edinburgh 1973/ital. Übs. Brescia 1985) — August Strobel, Ursprung und Geschichte des frühchristlichen Osterkalenders (TU 121) Berlin 1977 — Shemaryahu Talmon, The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judean Desert, in: Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls ed. Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin (ScrHie 4) Jerusalem 1958. ^{2}1965, 162-199 = Kalender und Kalenderstreit in der Gemeinde von Qumran,

in: Ders., Gesellschaft und Literatur in der Hebräischen Bibel. Gesammelte Aufsätze I (Information Judentum 8) Neukirchen 1988, 152-189 — James C(laire) VANDERKAM, The Temple Scroll and the Book of Jubilees, in: Temple Scroll Studies. Papers presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll. Manchester, December 1987. Edited by George J. Brooke (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha. Supplement Series 7) Sheffield 1989, 211-236 — Ben Zion WACHOLDER-David B. WEISBERG, Visibility of the New Moon in Cuneiform and Rabbinic Sources: HUCA 42 (1971) 227-242 = Ben Zion Wacholder, Essays on Jewish Chronology and Chronography (New York 1976) 59-74 — Yigael YADIN, The Temple Scroll I (Jerusalem 1983).

Orient. Seminar, Regina-Pacis-Weg 7,
53111 *Bonn*

Vigiliae Christianae 47 (1993), 390-397, © E. J. Brill, Leiden

LES APOPHTEGMES DES PÈRES

A PROPOS DE DEUX ÉTUDES RÉCENTES

PAR

G.J.M. BARTELINK

Récemment deux publications ont paru sur les Apophtegmes des Pères (les Sentences ascétiques des anciens pères égyptiens du désert), qui méritent qu'on les signale. Dans les Sources Chrétiennes le premier tome de l'édition de la collection dite systématique des Apophtegmes a vu le jour. Nous regrettons que le Père J.-C. Guy, par sa mort survenue en 1986, n'ait pas vu lui-même le résultat d'un travail auquel il avait consacré une grande part de sa vie. Son manuscrit a été mis au point par M.B. Flusin.[1] Puis il y a l'étude de M. Gould qui concerne certains aspects de la vie au désert: l'enseignement des idéals et de la pratique de la vie monastique en tant que vie commune.[2] L'auteur relève que la recherche de la solitude, la retraite dans la cellule et le silence étaient sans doute des moyens indispensables au moine pour atteindre le salut, mais que le désert n'était pas un but en soi et que les «habitants du désert» avaient souvent conscience d'appartenir à un groupe. Ainsi M. Gould s'est-il proposé d'étudier d'abord ce que les Apophtegmes disent sur les relations entre les ermites sous l'aspect de l'hospitalité, des agapes et des synaxes, ensuite ce que ces écrits revèlent sur les rapports de l'abba avec son disciple et, enfin, sur les rapports que l'ermite en général entretenait avec ses voisins.

On sait que, pendant les siècles, les Apophtegmes ont tenu une place centrale dans le monachisme oriental.[3] Ces brèves sentences, anecdotes et historiettes qui reflètent la spiritualité des débuts du monachisme,[4] ont été incessamment lecture favorite et source de méditation. Le grand nombre de traductions dans les langues modernes témoigne de l'intérêt que les Occidentaux également portent, aujourd'hui encore, à ces textes variés et hétérogènes.[5] Il y en a de très brefs (p.ex. SC 387, p. 215: Un vieillard dit: «Le lion est fort; et pourtant, à cause de son ventre, il tombe dans un piège et toute sa force est détruite.»), mais il y en a beau-

coup qui, plus développés, contiennent des dialogues et de petites histoires.

La tradition du texte est extrêmement compliquée. Les premiers à l'étudier furent Th. Hopfner (le texte copte: 1917) et notamment W. Bousset (1923).[6] Le dernier compara toutes les collections d'apophtegmes déjà éditées dans les différentes langues et analysa le ms. grec *Berlin* 1624 et quelques mss. de la Bibliothèque synodale de Moscou. Quelques décennies après, ce travail a été continué par le Père Guy qui publia ses résultats en 1962.[7] Celui-ci a délibérément restreint son analyse aux mss. grecs (le fonds de la Bibliothèque nationale de Paris et une quinzaine d'autres manuscrits) et à la version latine faite au VIe siècle par Pélage et Jean. Il a laissé de côté les mss. postérieurs au XIVe siècle, qui n'ont guère d'importance, et les collections abrégées dans les compilations d'*ascetica*. Convaincu qu'il était de l'impossibilité d'écrire l'histoire du texte des *Apophthegmata Patrum*, il a entrepris de retracer «l'économie générale des collections».[8]

Le point de départ était que les recueils complets se répartissent en deux groupes principaux. Dans le premier groupe, le compilateur donne d'abord un classement selon l'ordre alphabétique des noms des moines, puis la série des pièces anonymes, réparties plus ou moins selon des catégories (les collections dites alphabético-anonymes). Dans le deuxième groupe, le classement se fait en une vingtaine de chapitres qui correspondent à des vertus monastiques. Ici chaque chapitre contient d'abord les apophtegmes attribués à un moine dont le nom est cité (dans l'ordre alphabétique), puis les apophtegmes anonymes (les collections systématiques). Le Père Guy a démontré que les collections mixtes (assez nombreuses) dérivent de ces deux grands types normaux.

Les recueils d'apophtegmes manquent d'homogénéité. Il n'est pas possible de reconstituer un archétype à partir des diverses traditions. Chaque copiste pouvait compléter et adapter la collection à copier. Ainsi les *Gerontica* ou *Paterica* dont chaque monastère possédait au moins un exemplaire, étaient différents les uns des autres. Ainsi que le Père Guy l'a constaté,[9] nous n'avons guère de renseignements positifs directs sur la façon dont ces recueils, dans l'ensemble, ont été composés ou amplifiés. Le colophon d'une collection du *Fonds grec* de la Bibliothèque nationale (*Par. gr.* 1598, de 1071/72) nous apprend comment une nouvelle collection pouvait se faire quand un exemplaire usé devait être remplacé. Le moine chargé de cette tâche écrit qu'il a emprunté des exemplaires aux monastères voisins et que, de ces matériaux, il a fait un nouveau recueil alphabétique en deux tomes.

Puis il y a, dans la plupart des manuscrits de la collection alphabético-anonyme,[10] un prologue anonyme qui nous apprend que le compilateur se proposait de grouper selon l'ordre alphabétique la masse chaotique des matériaux transmis, et d'adopter ensuite pour les pièces anonymes un classement ἐν κεφαλαίοις (en chapitres; sans doute selon les sujets).

On comprendra l'intérêt de l'édition du texte grec de la collection systématique par le Père Guy. Enfin cette partie de la tradition est devenue accessible. Jusqu'ici seule la collection alphabético-anonyme avait été éditée en grande partie. Pour son édition de l'*Alphabeticon* (1677), J.-B. Cotelier s'était basé en premier lieu sur le *Par. gr.* 1599.[11] Puis une partie essentielle de la série d'apophtegmes anonymes, groupés selon les sujets, fut publiée par F. Nau.[12] Tandis que cette partie de la tradition avait été déjà l'objet des recherches de W. Bousset (le ms. *Berlin* 1624) et de R. Draguet (le ms. *Londres, Addit.* 22508), le Père Guy a encore analysé une douzaine de mss. de ce type.[13] Le Père Regnault, en utilisant des matériaux pris dans plusieurs manuscrits, a traduit en français toute la série des apophtegmes anonymes.[14] Dans ses *Recherches* (p. 63-88) Guy a démontré que les numéros 133-369 de cette collection d'anonymes qui suivent l'*Alphabeticon*, constituent la partie la plus ancienne, qu'ils ont été précédés de trois collections plus brèves et que plus de 300 pieces ont été ajoutées après coup à cet appendice de la collection alphabétique. D. Chitty, spécialiste dans le domaine du monachisme primitif, s'est rallié à cette analyse.[15]

Guy[16] a fait ensuite des recherches sur «les grandes étapes parcourues par la collection systématique normale dans son développement»[17] sans toutefois prétendre décrire dans le détail l'évolution historique de la collection puisqu'il n'avait étudié qu'une partie de la tradition manuscrite. Ne fournissant que quelques jalons, il conclut que la collection telle que nous la connaissons se manifeste d'abord sous la forme actuellement représentée par la traduction latine de Jean et Pélage (PJ),[18] la forme la plus courte que nous possédions aujourd'hui. La deuxième phase est l'augmentation de PJ par environ 75 apophtegmes, suivie par l'intégration du dossier d'Isaïe de Scété[19] qui se faisait ou bien «comme lot additionnel, figurant aux fins de chapitres *après* les 75 pièces» ou bien «intégré à sa place normale dans les séries alphabétiques des débuts de chaque chapitre».[20] Cette dernière collection s'est enrichie «encore d'environ 85 pièces, toutes anonymes».

Plusieurs indications nous permettent de croire que les deux grandes collections se sont constituées vers la fin du Ve siècle. Du fait que

Pélage (devenu pape en 555 ou 556) et Jean (devenu pape en 560) ont fait une traduction latine de la collection systématique on peut conclure qu'une collection en grec existait vers 530. Si nous pouvons remonter un peu plus haut (premières décennies du VIe siècle), c'est parce que, dans ses *Alloquia*, Zosimas se réfère à un livre d'*Apophtegmes* («quand nous lisions dans les apophtegmes des pères»). C'est le Père Regnault qui a attiré l'attention sur ce fait et qui de plus a exploité quelques passages dans la *Vie d'Euthyme* par Cyrille de Scythopolis[21] qui nous fournissent un *terminus a quo*. Cyrille n'a écrit cette Vie qu'en 537, mais il a utilisé des sources anciennes. Euthyme cite plusieurs apophtegmes et dans quelques cas la source est mentionnée (p. ex. dans le ch. 24: «Écoutez ... un récit utile à l'âme et très véridique, que m'ont conté certains anciens d'Égypte en visite chez moi»). De tels textes il ressort qu'au milieu du Ve siècle, les apophtegmes étaient déjà bien connus en Palestine, mais qu'ils l'étaient par tradition orale. Par conséquent, ce ne fut qu'après la mort d'Euthyme (473) que les collections écrites d'apophtegmes commencèrent à se répandre.

Bousset reconnut que l'esprit des apophtegmes était en grande partie celui du désert de la Scété, où Ammon, Macaire, Pambo, Arsène et Bessarion étaient les représentants principaux. Il avait essayé de distinguer entre la génération ancienne des moines Scétiotiques et la plus jeune, et avait déjà vu que Poemen et ses disciples de toute vraisemblance avaient joué un rôle important.[22] Près d'un cinquième des Apophtegmes selon l'ordre alphabétique se présente sous le nom de Poemen.

Selon Regnault — et son opinion est partagée par Guy et Gould — il faut chercher en Palestine l'origine du texte écrit. Avant lui, Chitty avait déjà suggéré que la collection écrite n'avait pas ses racines dans la Scété elle-même, mais qu'elle était née dans la *diaspora* (comme il l'appelait), pendant la période où — après les attaques des barbares au début du Ve siècle — la prospérité du mouvement monastique dans la Scété avait pris une fin abrupte et beaucoup de moines se rendaient ailleurs.[23]

Sur le développement primitif des apophtegmes on ne peut faire que des conjectures. Il y aurait eu d'abord une tradition orale, en grande partie en copte, peut-être partiellement en grec. Des sentences sous le nom des moines les plus renommés commencèrent à circuler. Puis certains moines composèrent de petits recueils dans le but d'édifier.[24] Pallade et Cassien étaient sans doute au courant de l'existence de tels recueils. Tout porte à croire qu'aux premières décennies du Ve siècle

des recueils comportant des sentences de plusieurs moines (en copte, grec et syrien) s'étaient déjà constitués, et ce sont là les prédécesseurs immédiats des grandes collections décrites plus haut.

En fait, l'apophtegme remonte aux origines mêmes du monachisme. On en trouve déjà un exemple dans la *Vita Antonii* (ch. 85: il faut que, comme le poisson vers la mer, le moine se hâte vers le désert). C'est à bon droit que Guy[25] a fait observer que l'ensemble disparate des Apophtegmes provient du fait que les premiers moines devaient élaborer eux-mêmes, par leur expérience personnelle, un «mode d'emploi» pour leur vie au désert.

Beaucoup d'apophtegmes reflètent le rapport entre maître et disciple. C'est à ce rapport que Gould a consacré le deuxième chapitre (p. 26-87: «The Abba and his disciple») de son étude. L'ascèse étant un métier qu'il faut apprendre, l'ermite débutant a besoin du conseil de quelqu'un qui soit expérimenté dans la vie érémitique. «Donne-moi une parole» (Δός μοι ῥῆμα) et des formules analogues se trouvent partout dans les apophtegmes: au début il y avait donc une tradition essentiellement orale.[26]

Il est bien curieux que la langue des Apophtegmes grecs n'ait été guère étudiée. Il n'existe pas d'étude sur l'usage linguistique grec dans les Apophtegmes telle que Salonius, déjà en 1920, en avait fait une sur les apophtegmes en traduction latine.[27] Tout en présentant des niveaux différents, cette langue, pour la plus grande part, est simple et familière, notamment dans les parties narratives, ce qui se reflète tant dans la structure des phrases que dans le choix des mots. Qu'il suffise de quelques exemples pour étayer ce jugement. Ed. Guy, p. 420-421: Ποίησον ἀγάπην, πρὸς πάντας ἄρον ἡμᾶς. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· Καλῶς, καλῶς. «Aie la charité de nous conduire chez tous». Il leur répondait: «Bien, bien»); ibid., p. 412-413: Καὶ ὡς ἔθηκε τράπεζαν, ἰδού τινες κρούοντες. Καὶ λέγει ὁ γέρων τῷ μαθητῇ αὐτοῦ· Δὸς αὐτοῖς μικρὰν ἀθήραν, ὅτι ἀπὸ κόπου εἰσίν (Tandis qu'ils mangeaient, des visiteurs frappèrent à la porte, et le vieillard dit à son disciple: «Donne-leur un peu de bouillie, car ils sont fatigués».). Le Père Guy se montre versé dans le vocabulaire monastique qui se caractérise par des tournures et des sens spécifiques. Πόσα ἔτη ἔχεις εἰς τὸ σχῆμα; («Depuis combien de temps portes-tu l'habit?») demande-t-on à un moine (p. 340-341). Parmi les notes assez brèves dans son édition, plusieurs se rapportent à l'usage et au sens de tel mot, par exemple l'observation intéressante que φιλοσοφία au sens de «vie monastique» dans la collection systématique ne se trouve que dans une citation de

Grégoire (de Nazianze) (p. 339): le vocable n'appartient pas au vocabulaire des moines de Scété. Dans les Apophtegmes se trouvent parfois des mots rares: pour λακέντιον le Père Guy fait remarquer que sa traduction est conjecturale (p. 221[1]); de même, le sens de τοπάριν n'est pas tout à fait sûr («tombeau», p. 347[1]).

A bon droit Guy traduit παρρησία au sens péjoratif (dans le commerce entre les moines) par «familiarité» (p. 181), tandis que M. Gould s'en tient à une traduction neutre «freedom of speech» (Gould, p. 166); mais cet excès de familiarité qu'il faut éviter ne se manifeste pas uniquement en paroles.

L'étude de M. Gould, si utile par les analyses judicieuses d'un grand nombre de textes qui se rapportent aux règles de conduite sociale au désert, présente un tableau vif de certains aspects de la vie des ascètes qui — comme ceux de la Scété — vivaient pour ainsi dire dans des colonies. Au moyen d'exemples souvent frappants, les Sentences illustrent comment les ascètes dans leurs rapports réciproques doivent éviter tout ce qui pourrait nuire à autrui: tout jugement négatif ou défavorable, tout forme d'irritation, de conflit ou de médisance.

L'édition des Apophtegmes que le Père Guy avait préparée depuis longtemps, issue de vaste recherches sur les manuscrits, se fonde sur une base solide. L'éditeur s'étant tout à fait familiarisé avec le vocabulaire monastique dont il connaît toutes les nuances, sa traduction s'avère fidèle jusque dans le détail. B. Flusin, qui a revu le manuscrit du Père Guy, s'est permis cependant cette petite modification: «alors que le Père Guy avait eu tendance à privilégier le manuscrit Y, j'ai donné la préférence aux accords avec la traduction latine» (p. 8).

NOTES

[1] *Les Apophtegmes des Pères. Collection systématique, Chapitres I-IX.* Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par †Jean-Claude Guy s.j. (Sources Chrétiennes 387), Paris 1993.

[2] Graham Gould, *The Desert Fathers on Monastic Community* (Oxford Early Christian Studies), Oxford 1993.

[3] L'anthologie que Paulus Evergetinus avait composée au onzième siècle a été rééditée à Athènes (4 volumes, 1957-1966: Εὐεργετινὸς ἤτοι συναγωγὴ τῶν θεοφθόγγων ῥημάτων καὶ διδασκαλιῶν τῶν θεοφόρων καὶ ἁγίων πατέρων). On verra sur les Apophtegmes en général les articles encyclopédiques de F. Cavallera (*DSp* 1, 1937, 765-770) et de P. de Labriolle (*RAC* 1, 1942, 545-550).

[4] C'est en utilisant les nombreux apophtegmes donnés sous le nom d'Antoine comme pierre de touche, que H. Dörries a examiné l'historicité du portrait d'Antoine fait par

Athanase: *Die Vita Antonii als Geschichtsquelle* (Nachrichten der Akad. der Wissensch. in Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Kl. 14), Göttingen 1949, 357-410; réimpr. dans: id., *Wort und Stunde* I: Gesammelte Studien zur Kirchengeschichte des vierten Jahrhunderts, Göttingen 1965, 145-224. Th. Baumeister a également puisé dans cette source: Die Mentalität des frühen ägyptischen Mönchtums. Zur Frage der Ursprünge des christlichen Mönchtums, *ZKG* 88 (1977), 146-160.

[5] *Weisung der Väter. Apophtegmata Patrum, auch Gerontikon oder Alphabeticum genannt*, eingeleitet und übersetzt von Bonifaz Miller, Freiburg im Breisgau 1965; L. Mortari, *I padri del deserto. Detti*, Rome 1972; Id., *Vita e detti dei Padri del deserto* 1-2, Rome 1975: B. Ward, *The Sayings of the Desert Fathers. The alphabetical Collection*, Londres 1975 (1981²); ead., *The Wisdom of the Desert Fathers. The Apophthegmata Patrum (the anonymous series)*, Oxford 1975; J.-C. Guy, *Paroles des anciens. Apophtegmes des Pères du désert*, Paris 1976; L. Regnault, *Les sentences des Pères du désert*. Troisième recueil et tables, Solesmes 1976; Id., *Les sentences des Pères du désert. Collection alphabétique*, Solesmes 1981; Chr. Wagenaar, *Woestijnvaders. Een speurtocht door de Vaderspreuken*, Nimègue-Beveren 1981; L. Regnault, *Abba, dis-moi une parole. Paroles mémorables des Pères du désert*, Sablé-sur-Sarthe 1984; Id., *Les Sentences des Pères du désert: Série des anonymes*, Solesmes 1985.

[6] Th. Hopfner, *Über die koptisch-sa'idischen Apophthegmata Patrum Aegyptiorum und verwandte griechische, lateinische, koptisch-bohaïrische und syrische Sammlungen*, dans: Denkschriften der k. Ak. der Wiss. in Wien, 41,2, Vienne 1918; W. Bousset, *Apophthegmata : Studien zur Geschichte des ältesten Mönchtums*, Tubingue 1923, 1-208.

[7] J.-C. Guy, *Recherches sur la tradition grecque des Apophthegmata Patrum* (Subsidia Hagiographica 36), Bruxelles 1962; réimprimées avec des compléments en 1984.

[8] Cette formulation est de R. Draguet, Le Paterikon de l'Add. 22508 du British Museum, *Le Muséon* 63, 1950, 27.

[9] *Recherches*, p. 8.

[10] Texte: *PG* 65, 72-76; sur ce prologue on verra Guy, *Recherches* 13-15; 193s.

[11] *Monumenta Ecclesiae Graecae* t. I, Paris 1677, 338-712; repris dans *PG* 65, 71-440.

[12] Histoires des solitaires égyptiens, *ROC* 12-18 (entre 1907-1913; environ 400 apophtegmes).

[13] *Recherches*, 16ss.

[14] L. Regnault, *Les Sentences des Pères du désert: Série des Anonymes*, Solesmes 1985.

[15] D. Chitty, The Books of the Old Men, *Eastern Churches Review* 6 (1974), 15-21.

[16] *Recherches*, 117-200.

[17] *Ibid.*, 190.

[18] H. Rosweyde, *Vitae Patrum sive historiae eremiticae libri decem*, Ultraiecti-Antverpiae 1615 (1628²), reproduit dans *PL* 73 et 74. Cfr. A. Wilmart, Le recueil Latin des Apophtegmes, *RBén* 34 (1922), 85-198; C.M. Battle, *Die adhortationes sanctorum patrum (Verba seniorum) im lateinischen Mittelalter*. Überlieferung und Fortwirkung (Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Mönchtums und des Benediktinerordens 31), Münster 1972; édition critique de la collection de Paschasius de Dumium (*PL* 73, 1025-1062): J.G. Freire, *A Versâo Latina por Pascásio de Dume dos Apophthegmata Patrum* 1-2, Coimbra 1971.

[19] Edition de la collection d'abba Isaïe par R. Draguet: *Les cinq recensions de l'Asceticon syriaque d'Abba Isaïe* I. Introduction au problème isaïen. Version des logoi I-XIII avec les parallèles grecs et latins (CSCO 293; Scriptores Syri 122), Louvain 1968.

[20] *Recherches*, 187.

[21] Les Apophtegmes en Palestine aux Ve-VIe siècles, *Irénikon* 54 (1981) 320-330. Bousset, qui, lui aussi, a commenté ces textes, les considéra comme des anachronismes de Cyrille.

[22] *O.l.*, 60-66.

[23] D.J. Chitty, *The Desert a City*. An Introduction to the Study of Egyptian and Palestinian Monasticism under the Christian Empire, Oxford 1966 (1977[2]), 60-61; 66-71.

[24] Cfr. K. Heussi, *Der Ursprung des Mönchtums*, Tubingue 1936 (Aalen 1981), 143[1].

[25] SC 387, p. 20.

[26] On verra la caractérisation des Apophtegmes par J.-C. Guy, *Les Apopthegmata Patrum*, dans *Théologie de la vie monastique*, Paris 1961, 73-83 (cfr. également SC 387, 18-23).

[27] A.H. Salonius, *Vitae Patrum*. Kritische Untersuchungen über Text, Syntax und Wortschatz der spät-lateinischen Vitae Patrum (B. III, V, VI, VII), Lund 1920.

6523 LH *Nijmegen*, Postweg 152

Vigiliae Christianae 47 (1993), 398-413, © E. J. Brill, Leiden

REVIEWS

Tertulliano, *De corona*. Introduzione, testo, traduzione e note a cura di Fabio Ruggiero. Milan, Mondadori, 1992, LIV, 184 p.

For those who want to get acquainted with Tertullian's oeuvre, his *De corona* is an attractive choice. It is a relatively short work, which contains all the characteristics of the author's style and power of argument. Moreover, it introduces a subject which even today is hotly debated, viz. the Christian attitude towards military service. Fontaine's richly annotated edition (Paris 1966, see this journal 26, 227-231) provides all the assistance a student might be looking for, apart from a translation. In this respect the new Italian edition under review here is a step forward, especially in view of the general reliability of Dr. Ruggiero's rendering. R., however, also presents a new critical text, which is accompanied by a large number of notes, which wellnigh amount to a full commentary, and some indices.

As regards the text, R. shows even more respect for the Agobardinus than Fontaine. This can be witnessed in the very first section of the treatise, where he takes leave from Kroymann's compromise, accepted by Fontaine, in which both A's *adibant* and the other mss.'s *adhibetur* are upheld. R. only prints *adibant*, explaining his choice quite persuasively. A more curious case is 7.8, where Kroymann, printing A's *pertinere*, assumes the loss of a verbal form like *scimus*, and Fontaine follows the other mss.'s *pertinent*, which indeed seems a little suspect in view of *pertinent* in the sentence immediately following. R.'s *pertinere*, however, is rather surprising, not least because an adequate explanation is lacking. In 14.4 R. boldly chooses A's *cruci*, called a "leçon tentante" by Fontaine, which has to be interpreted as a dat. of the agent, instead of Iunius' *in cruce*, printed by Kroymann and Fontaine. These few instances may suffice. R. also pays ample attention to punctuation, differing from his predecessors in not a few places. For this reason the komma after *tolerantia* in 14.3 presumably is a mistake.

In his translation of the text R. intends to make his own decisions, abandoning current explanations in more than one case, which of course does neither warrant his right nor his wrong. In rendering

habitus (5.2-3) by "foggia" ('fashion', 'style') he seems to improve on others, but *privatim* (7.1), "in particolare"—which, although R. fails to mention it, was already suggested by Fontaine—remains open to doubt. In 7.7 *illic*, "al interno della sua opera" (i.e. 'within Claudius Saturninus' oeuvre') is far from convincing. Curiously, R. here does not effectuate his predilection for A, which has *illi*, printed by Kroymann (who, however, presents it as his own conjecture, ascribing *illic* to A, in contrast to the app. crit. in both R. and Fontaine). In 10.6 *quod* is a relative pronoun, not a conjunction, as implied in R.'s rendering. One final suggestion, which concerns *ad omnem aditum et exitum* (3.4). Could not this be a reminiscence of *Dominus custodiat introitum tuum et exitum tuum* (Ps 121.8)?

These short remarks may show that Tertullian has been well served by R.'s effort.

2353 BM *Leiderdorp*, van Effendreef 15 J. DEN BOEFT

Luigi Perrone (ed.), *Il cuore indurito del Faraone. Origene e il problema del libero arbitrio.* (Origini. Testi e Studi del Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi sull'Ebraismo e sul Cristianesimo antico 3). Genova, Marietti, 1992. ix & 151 pp. L. 34.000.

This book contains an interesting collection of articles on Origen's discussion of the problem of free will based on a conference held at the University of Pisa in 1991. Its content is as follows: L. Perrone, 'Premessa', vii-ix; E. Norelli, 'Marcione e gli gnostici sul libero arbitrio, e la polemica di Origene', 1-30; L. Perrone, 'La parrhêsia di Mosè: l'argomentazione di Origene nel trattato sul libero arbitrio e il metodo delle "quaestiones et responsiones" ', 31-64; A. Roselli, "Ο τεχνίτης θεός: la pratica terapeutica come paradigma dell'operare di Dio in *Phil.* 27 e *PA* III 1', 65-84; A. M. Castagno, 'L'interpretazione origeniana di *Mc.* 4, 10-12: aspetti e problemi della difesa del libero arbitrio', 85-104; F. Cocchini, 'La "quaestio" sul libero arbitrio e l'interpretazione origeniana di *Rm.* 9 nel *Commentario alla Lettera ai Romani'*, 105-118; R. Penna, 'Interpretazione origeniana ed esegesi odierna di *Rm.* 9, 6-29', 119-140; Indici, 141-151.

The articles mostly take Origen's long polemic argument in *De principiis* 3.1 as their starting-point, with occasional references to the rele-

vant passages in *De oratione*, the *Philocalia* and the *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Readers of *VChr.* will be interested most in the first four articles. Norelli argues that Origen's picture of his opponents' rejection of free will is grossly distorted (which is hardly surprising and which had in more general terms been pointed out before by A. le Boulluec) and that it ignores the subtle differences between the various Gnostic groups in this respect. He claims that both the Valentinian Gnostics and the Marcionites did to some extent allow for a free will on the part of man (and on the part of the aeons as well). His discussion centers on the Gnostic tripartition of *pneumatikoi, psuchikoi* and *hulikoi*, which does not, in his view, reflect a divinely determined classification of different groups of people, but rather three different 'Wesensbestimmungen' or possible destinations, the choice for one of which is up to man. Free will does exist on the level of the *psuchikon*, and the fundamental difference between the *pneumatikoi* and the *psuchikoi* is that the former *know* that they are saved — although, as the *Gospel of Philip* warns, even the *pneumatikoi* may lose their state of freedom from matter and sin. Not all of Norelli's arguments are completely convincing to me (for the fact remains that there is some sort of predetermination of *pneumatikoi* and *psuchikoi*; and it remains unclear how the notion of free decision is related to the idea of salvation consisting in being initiated in a secret *revelatory* knowledge); moreover, he sometimes seems inspired by the desire to represent the Gnostics as closer to (Roman Catholic) orthodoxy than they were thought to be (e.g. p. 12: 'Ma dire che lo gnostico ha una "natura salvata", che egli fa parte del seme di elezione e che tale condizione non dipende dalle opere compiute, non è, di per sé, più eretico delle considerazione di Paolo in *Rm.* 9, 6-12'). His article is nicely mirrored by Castagno's contribution, which appropriately stresses that Origen is mainly concerned with combating what his opponents have in common — viz. the danger their doctrines entail for the Christian ethics of human responsibility. Perrone claims that the argument in *Princ.* 3.1 is structured according to the model of *problêmata kai luseis* as inaugurated by Peripatetic dialectic and literary criticism (cf. Aristotle, *Poetics* ch. 25), applied by Origen to some controversial Biblical passages and exemplified by the candour of Moses' discussion with God on Mount Sinai. Roselli studies the role of medical imagery in Origen's portrayal of God's gradual propaedeutic restoration of mankind and of the whole cosmos (in which God's hardening of Pharaoh's heart is compared with the physician's

provocation of the outburst of a painful abscess). She points to several illuminating parallels with medical literature but concludes that the medical metaphors are to be explained as standard rhetorical *paradeigmata* rather than as direct borrowings from Hippocratic or Galenic writings. The other articles deal with Origen's exegesis of several seemingly predestinarian Biblical passages.

My general impression is that this volume, though in itself interesting and occasionally illuminating, could have offered more new insights if the papers had been more problem-oriented than they are, if the editor would have insisted on more explicit coordination between the various papers (e.g. between those by Castagno and Norelli, or those by Roselli and Castagno, e.g. on the interpretation of τάχα) and if a greater variety of subjects had been addressed (e.g., the psychological aspects of free will and Origen's appeal to personal experience in *Princ.* 3.1.4 would have deserved more attention). A more systematic analysis of Origen's use of the pagan philosophical tradition on determinism, choice and weakness of will (*akrasia*) would have been useful too (it is remarkable that no reference is made to Richard Sorabji's *Necessity, Cause and Blame*). Another study which ought to have been mentioned is the fine analysis of the problem of evil and free will by A. Meïs Wörmer, *El Problema del mal en Orígenes*, Santiago 1988. However, these remarks do not detract from the merits of this book, which marks a significant contribution to the study of this important aspect of Origen's thought.

Leiden University, Department of Classics
P.O. Box 9515, 2300 RA Leiden PH. J. VAN DER EIJK

Hermias, *Satire des philosophes païens.* Introduction, texte critique, notes, appendices et index par R.P.C. Hanson et ses collègues. Traduction française par Denise Joussot (Sources Chrétiennes 388). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1993. 150 p. 131 F.

Cette édition est le résultat d'une collaboration de sept membres des facultés de théologie, philosophie et littérature classique de l'Unversité de Manchester, sous la direction du Professeur R.P.C. Hanson. Ils se sont réunis pour la préparer de 1980 à 1984. Il va de soi qu'un tel équipe, qui travaille sur un texte tellement bref, s'occupera de tous les problèmes possibles. «Nous pouvons sans exagérer dire que cette édition est la plus complète jamais entreprise», dit la Préface.

Les manuscrits du διασυρμός (*Irrisio*) sont tous d'époque très tardive, à l'exception du manuscrit de Patmos, P, qui est du XIe ou XIIe siècle. La présente édition est la première à utiliser P depuis que Knopf en 1906 a attiré l'attention à ce manuscrit. Il est intéressant de constater, combien de conjectures des éditeurs antérieurs, spécialement celles du premier éditeur, R. Seiler (1553), ont trouvé confirmation dans ce vieux manuscrit.

Quant à la datation de l'*Irrisio* les éditeurs en viennent à 200 ap. J.-C. environ. On trouve la même opinion chez J.H. Waszink dans son article 'Hermias', *RAC* 14, 808-815, que les éditeurs n'ont pu consulter, parce qu'il est paru en 1988. Ils consentent aussi avec Waszink dans la solution de la question des rapports entre Hermias et la tradition doxographique, spécialement de sa relation avec la *Cohortatio ad Graecos* de Pseudo-Justin. «Le Pseudo-Justin dépend d'Hermias et non l'inverse» (p. 34). «Dann aber liegt es näher, mit Di Pauli anzunehmen, der Autor der Cohortatio habe die von Hermias gebotene Doxographie nur zum Teil kopiert» (811).

«La raillerie au sujet des philosophes qui ne sont pas des notres» (τῶν ἔξω φιλοσόφων) est faite par Hermias d'ùne façon très vive et personnelle. Les éditeurs tirent l'attention sur le caractère propre de ce petit traité.

La constitution du texte grec est faite d'une façon très consciencieuse. Je voudrais faire deux petites remarques. Parmi les quatorze theories sur l'âme en ch. 2 (ch. 1 chez Migne) on trouve: οἱ δὲ στοιχεῖον ⟨ἢ⟩ ἀπὸ στοιχείων, «d'autres (considèrent l'âme) comme un élément ⟨ou⟩ un composé d'éléments». Cette conjecture a été faite à la lumière d'un texte d'Aristote, *De anima* A 2: διὸ καὶ οἱ τῷ γινώσκειν ὁριζόμενοι αὐτὴν (sc. τὴν ψυχὴν) ἢ στοιχεῖον ἢ ἐκ τῶν στοιχείων ποιοῦσι. Mais est-il nécessaire d'intervenir dans le texte? Je voudrais interpréter le texte des manuscrits de la manière suivante: «autres (considèrent l'âme) comme un élément qui résulte d'éléments», c'est-à-dire, qui résulte d'un changement d'éléments. Il faut penser à la théorie héraclitienne/stoïcienne selon laquelle il y a un changement permanent des éléments (feu, air, eau, terre, eau, air, feu). Le feu est à la fin «un élément qui résulte d'éléments». C'est une moquerie d'Hermias de le formuler ainsi.

Après avoir énuméré ces théories concernant l'âme Hermias poursuit: Ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἔστω· στασιάζουσι μὲν περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ περὶ αὐτῆς ὁμονοοῦντες ἀπεφήναντο· †καὶ ἄλλοι† τὴν ἡδονὴν αὐτῆς ὁ μέν τις ἀγαθὸν καλεῖ, ὁ δέ τις κακόν, ὁ δ' αὖ μέσον ἀγαθοῦ καὶ κακοῦ ... («Eh bien soit! Ils ne sont pas d'accord sur l'âme ... Mais sur les autres questions la concernant,

ils se sont montrés d'accord! Sur le plaisir de l'âme l'un dit que c'est un bien, l'autre un mal, un troisième le situe entre bien et mal»). Il me semble que les astérisques après ψυχῆς peuvent disparaître. Après l'énumeration des quatorze théories *sur l'âme*, il va de soi que περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς signifie «sur l'âme elle-même», à l'opposé des autres questions la concernant (τὰ λοιπα περὶ αὐτῆς). Il est évident que les mots ὁμονοοῦντες ἀπεφήναντο sont un sarcasme. Je me demande s'il n'est pas préférable de poser un point d'interrogation après ἀπεφήνατο, et alors lire καὶ ἄλλως, ce qui pourrait signifier: 'au contraire'.

Que les éditeurs veuillent accepter ces suggestions comme un signe d'intérêt à leur édition précieuse.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106 J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

Origène, *Homélies sur les Juges*. Texte de la version latine de Rufin, introduction, traduction, notes et index par Pierre Messié, s.j., Louis Neyrand, s.j., Marcel Borret, s.j. (Sources Chrétiennes 389). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1993. 248 p. 215 F.

Voici un autre texte d'Origène, édité selon la formule bien-connue des Sources Chrétiennes. Le texte grec de ces homélies n'a pas été transmis, mais leur traducteur, Rufin, dit les avoir rendues «simplement comme il les a trouvées, et sans beaucoup de pein» (cf. p. 42). Avec les éditeurs je crois qu'on à affaire ici à une traduction fidèle.

Dans la huitième homélie Origène explique d'une façon très intéressante le texte des *Juges* 6,36-40. Gédéon y obtient deux signes: d'abord la rosée tombe sur la toison de laine, tandis que tout le sol reste sec; ensuite la rosée descend sur toute la terre, tandis que la toison reste sec. Origène voit dans la toison l'image d'Israel, et dans les deux signes la situation d'Israel avant et après la venue du Seigneur. (On retrouve cette allégorisation chez Théodoret de Cyr P.G. 80,502 C-D et Procope P.G. 87/1, 1068 A.)

Et quand il est dit que Gédéon, après le premier signe, «pressa la toison dans un bassin, qu'il remplit d'eau», Origène combine ce texte avec Joh. 13,4 où le Seigneur «verse de l'eau dans un bassin et lave les pieds de ses disciples». Et l'adhortation du Seigneur aux disciples de laver aussi les pieds les uns aux autres évoque chez Origène la spéculation suivante sur son activité de prédicateur: «Volo ergo et ego nunc *lavare*

pedes fratrum meorum, *lavare pedes* condiscipulorum meorum. Et propterea accipio aquam quam haurio de fontibus Istrahel, immo quam *exprimo* de Istrahelitico *vellere*. Exprimo enim nunc aquam de *vellere* libri Iudicum et alio tempore aquam de *vellere* Regnorum et aquam de *vellere* Esaiae vel Hieremiae; et *mitto* eam *in pelvem* animae meae concipiens sensum in corde meo et accipio pedes eorum qui se praebent et praeparant ad lavandum et, in quantum praevaleo, *lavare* cupio *pedes* fratrum meorum et complere mandatum Domini ut in verbo doctrinae purgentur auditores a sordibus peccatorum, ut abiciant a se omnem immunditiam vitiorum et mundos habeant *pedes* quibus recte ingrediantur *ad praeparationem Evangelii pacis* .... (VIII, 5, 45-58).

J'ai cité ce passage pour attirer l'attention du lecteur à cette série d'homélies. Elles contiennent un grand nombre d'allégorisations fascinantes, que les éditeurs ont bien fait de rendre plus accessibles par cette belle édition.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106 J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

Didyme l'Aveugle, *Traité du Saint-Esprit*. Introduction, texte critique, traduction, notes et index par Louis Doutreleau, s.j. (Sources Chrétiennes 386). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992. 449 p. 166 F.

Après avoir publié il y a trente ans le commentaire de Didyme l'Aveugle *Sur Zacharie* (trois volumes, S.C. 83-85) le Père Doutreleau présente maintenant un autre ouvrage du même auteur. Tandis que le *Sur Zacharie* nous est parvenu par l'heureuse découverte de Toura, le *Traité sur la Trinité* a connu un autre sort. Il a été traduit par Jérôme et grâce à la grande renommée de celui-ci il nous est conservé. Dans sa contribution au *Festschrift Quasten, Kyriakon* (1970) l'éditeur avait déjà fait une étude de la tradition manuscrite du *De Spiritu Sancto* de Didyme. Il espérait que par cet article quelqu'un se sentirait appellé à éditer ce texte. On ne peut qu'être content du fait que personne ne s'est présenté. Maintenant on dispose d'une édition du Traité de Didyme, dont chaque page témoigne d'une connaissance approfondie de Didyme, de son ouvrage et du monde dans lequel il fonctionnait.

Dans l'introduction l'auteur esquisse d'abord le développement de la pneumatologie jusqu'au Concile de Constantinople (381), en attirant l'attention spéciale sur la pneumatologie d'Athanase. Puis il montre

comment Didyme, qui marche dans le sillage d'Athanase, a néanmoins écrit un ouvrage d'une caractère différent, «Le militantisme d'Athanase ne convient pas au pacifique Didyme» (p. 55). «Après qu'Athanase a occupé sa vie à défendre «Nicée» comme une place forte, ... il est temps de rencontrer un auteur qui libère les intelligences du rationalisme disputeur et ouvre la porte au mystère vivant de l'Esprit. Didyme va rendre ce service à l'âme chrétienne» (p. 36). L'auteur qualifie la manière de Didyme comme «plus didactique, un peu traînante, plus contemplative» (39).

Ensuite il analyse le traité et donne un large exposé de sa théologie et consacre quelques réflexions au traducteur latin. Dans le chapitre sur la tradition du texte l'éditeur raconte, comment il a réussi à établir ordre dans le grand nombre de manuscrits: il était possible de ranger les familles, déjà établies par les variantes, selon l'ordre croissant des omissions identiques. On discerne six familles dont il y a trois qui sont indépendantes. L'éditeur a reduit l'apport de ces trois familles à trois mss. de chacune.

Le texte latin est imprimé d'une façon impeccable, la traduction est excellente, les notes sont très utiles. Quatre index (citations scripturaires, mots grecs laissés par S. Jérôme, noms propres, mots latins) complètent ce livre, qui est un grand enrichissement de la série 'Sources Chrétiennes'.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106 J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

Gregor von Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium I 1-146*. Eingeleitet, übersetzt und kommentiert von Jürgen-André Röder (Patrologia 2). Frankfurt/M-Berlin-Bern-New York-Paris-Wien, Peter Lang, 1993. XI, 312 S.

Diese Mainzer Dissertation, die unter Leitung von Andreas Spira hergestellt wurde, befaßt sich, wie man erwarten konnte, mit »der Verflechtung von rhetorischer Tradition und christlichem Denken« (S.IX). Der erste Teil des ersten Buches *Contra Eunomium* ist ein Beispiel dieser Verflechtung. Bevor Gregor sich der theologischen Auseinandersetzung widmet, wendet er sich an seinen Gegner persönlich und führt eine sehr große *argumentatio ad hominem* aus, in der sich eine Verknüpfung von traditioneller rhetorischer Form mit der apologetischen Zielsetzung Gre-

gors zeigt. »Die vorliegende Untersuchung beschränkt sich daher auf diesen ertsten Teil und versucht, neben der für das grundlegende Textverständnis erforderlichen Erklärung der Realien und der sprachlichen Probleme einige typische Merkmale christlicher literarischer Apologetik und Polemik aufzudecken« (S.5). Zunächst wird die historische und kirchenpolitische Situation des 4. Jahrhunderts kurz skizziert und wird ein Überblick über die literarische Dimension des trinitarischen Streites gegeben.

Dieser vorzüglichen Einleitung folgt eine ebenso vorzügliche Übersetzung des oft schwierig zu übersetzenden Textes. Um zu zeigen wie sich diese Übersetzung auswirkt, folgt hier ein Beispiel, in dem Gregor, wie oft, ein sehr sprechendes Bild gebraucht: »Doch damit ich nicht schon durch meine Ablehnung selbst mehr als nötig bei dem Unnützen verweile und damit nicht so wie der, der sein Pferd durch einen Morast hindurchtreibt und ganz von der dortigen Widerwärtigkeit erfüllt wird, ebenso auch ich mein Werk beschmutze, indem ich die Rede die Erwähnung dessen, was dort geschrieben ist, passieren lasse, ist es angebracht, so meine ich, den ganzen derartigen Wust, so wie es möglich ist, mit einem hohen und schnellen Sprung der Rede zu überspringen — ein hinreichender Gewinn nämlich ist der schnelle Rückzug von dem Widerwärtigen — und die Rede schnell auf das Ende des *Geschichtsüberblicks* zu lenken, damit nicht auch in mein Buch die Worte ihrer Erbitterung eingestreut werden« (CE I 30).

Der Kommentar enthält eine Menge interessanter Bemerkungen. Bezüglich CE I 17 τὰ ἐν προοιμίοις αὐτοῦ τερετίσματα möchte ich noch hinzufügen, daß Aristoteles (*Anal. Post.* I 22) den Terminus τερετίσματα für Platons Ideen gebraucht. Das ist vielleicht die berümteste Anwendung dieses Bildes, das zweimal in *Contra Celsum* von Origenes erwähnt wird (*CC* I 1, 13, 21; II 2, 12, 18; Sources Chrétiennes Ausgabe, Borret).

Arbeiten dieser Art sind für die Patristiker von großer Bedeutung.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106 J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

Remco F. Regtuit, *Severian of Gabala, Homily on the Incarnation of Christ (CPG 4204)*. VU University Press, Amsterdam, 1992.

CPG 4204 is one of the many homilies which the MSS tradition unanimously attributed to John Chrysostom, but has now for a long

time been ascribed to a contemporary of that famous orator, Severian of Gabala. In his doctoral thesis the author presents a critical edition of the text, which is preceded by a description of the manuscript tradition and further transmission of the text, an analysis of the sermon, a characterisation of the preacher and his art of preaching. A comparison with the undoubtedly authentic works of Severian confirms the ascription of the present sermon to him. This introduction is the result of a thorough and precise labour of investigation.

The Greek text, which has been printed in an impeccable way, is faced by an English translation on the opposite page. This addition is by no means superfluous in the case of rather difficult texts like this one. The translation, however, does give rise to some critical observations.

Severian begins his sermon as follows:

ὄντως ἐπεφάνη ἡμῖν ἡ τοῦ Χριστοῦ χάρις,
καὶ συνεξέλαμψεν ἡμῖν τῆς εὐσεβείας ἡ δύναμις·
ὄντως ἀνέτειλεν ἡμῖν ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἥλιος,
καὶ μαρτυρεῖ φωτισθέντα τῆς οἰκουμένης τὰ πέρατα.

In his analysis (p. 130) the author rightly observes: "The first part of each pair refers to the appearance of Christ, the second part represents the reaction of the world". But he translates: "Truly Christ's grace has appeared to us, and with it *the power of his majesty shines forth to us* (my italics) clearly. Truly the sun of righteousness has risen for us, and the ends of the earth witness this by their brightness". My question is: is 'the power of his majesty shining forth to us' something that 'represents the reaction of the world'? In my view the δύναμις τῆς εὐσεβείας must refer to the religious feelings evoked by the appearance of Christ.

In lines 40 ff. Severian argues that knowledge about Christ is not won by arguments or human wisdom. One has to ask the prophets, the apostles, the angels, or one has to go to the Father. Having shown that prophets, apostles and angels tell us who Christ is, but do not explain how he was begotten, Severian continues as follows: Ἀλλ' ἄρα μη ἄγγελοι μὲν σιωπῶσι καὶ προφῆται οὐκ ἀπαγγέλλουσι καὶ ἀπόστολοι ταμιεύονται, ὁ δὲ πατὴρ ὁ γεννήσας κηρύττει τὸν υἱὸν πῶς ἐγέννησεν; οὐδὲ αὐτός ... (79-81) The author translates: "But if the angels keep silent, and the prophets do not proclaim, and the apostles withhold information, *how will the Father who begot the son proclaim* how he begot him. Not even he himself..." The logic of the reasoning is far from clear. I would say that because of the fact that the Father begot the son, it could be expected that he would proclaim him. The reason for this curious

translation lies in the fact that the author did not understand the meaning of ἆρα μή, which governs the whole sentence. Severian asks: "is it perhaps so, that angels are silent, prophets do not speak, apostles withhold information, but that the Father who has begotten the son proclaims how he was begotten?" And he answers: "No, not even he himself".

Speaking about the creation, Severianus says: Καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα πάντα λόγῳ παρήγαγεν, ἀβίαστον ἔχων τὸ νεῦμα καὶ οὔτε κόπον ὑπομένων οὔτε ἱδρῶτα ὑφιστάμενος, ἀλλα τῷ λέγειν ἀκολουθοῦσαν ἔχων τὴν φύσιν τῶν γενομένων (116-118). Translation: "All the rest he produced by his word, *without forcing his will,* neither exerting himself, nor perspiring, but making *the growth* of all that exists follow his word". The idea of God forcing his will seems to me a strange one. I think that the βιή of ἀβίαστος is not inside God but outside Him. His will does not feel resistance or even is irresistible. — With regard to the last phrase of the text the author says on p. 167, note 26: "Note that here again φύσις means 'the coming into being' ... not the nature". That is correct, but why speak now of *the growth* of all things? I would propose: "but his word was followed by the (coming into) existence of the creation". This is the exegesis of "God said: 'let there be light', and there was light".

In line 140 Severian speaks about the qualities which make man the image of God. One of these qualities is the διακριτικὴ δύναμις, which is rendered by 'the power to decide'. I would suggest: 'the power to discern' or 'the power to distinguish'.

In lines 249 ff. Severian speaks about the angels who were distressed because of the sins of the human beings which they had to serve. They saw how the Lord's worthiness was betrayed and the idols were worshipped, and thought to themselves: Ἄλλος ὁ χορηγὸς καὶ ἄλλοι οἱ εὐχαριστούμενοι. Translation: "The one that provides and those who *are rewarded* are not the same". Here the verb (to reward) is not well chosen. The saying means: God provides, others (idols) receive the thankgivings (which are due to God). One cannot say that God is *rewarded.*

In ll. 279-280 Severian states that the angel of the Chaldeans saw that these people, who once had worshipped fire and revered idols, were now τὸν θεὸν ἐπὶ τῇ παραδοξοποιΐᾳ ὑμνοῦντας. Translation: "*miraculously* praising God with hymns". In my view, ἐπὶ τῇ παραδοξοποιΐᾳ means: on (= because of) the working of miracles.

In 1.303 the words Ἦν οὖν ἡ ἀντίστασις οὐ κακοῦ πρὸς ἀγαθόν are

translated "This opposition, *however*, was not that of an evil *man* against good". Severian was speaking of the opposition between two angels. One should, therefore, not render 'an evil *man*', but 'an evil being' opposing 'a good one'. Moreover, οὖν does not mean opposition (however) but consequence (therefore). Severin draws a conclusion. A correct translation of the particles is vital!

In lines 606 ff. Severian introduces his heretic opponents referring to a text of St. Paul, and then says: Μὴ ἡμεῖς ἐπλασάμεθα; Μὴ ἡμεῖς τὰ θεῖα ἐσυκοφαντήσαμεν; The author translates: "We did not invent this, we did not misrepresent the divine words". As in lines 79-81 the translator seems to be unaware of the use of μή introducing a question with a negative suggestion, often to be translated by 'perhaps'. So here: "Did we perhaps invent this?"

In lines 421-423 Severian introduces his opponent saying that his (Severian's) theology introduces God wavering and saying 'There will be many teachers of error, what will happen then?' (God's wavering is indicated in these last words). And he continues: καὶ τὸν πατέρα λέγοντα τῷ υἱῷ ὡς ἐκείνου μὲν ἀποροῦντος, τούτου δὲ διδάσκοντος ταῦτα. Translation: "and the Father speaking to his Son, as if *the latter* did not know, and *he* would teach him this". This is an awkward rendering. Who is who in the last phrase? As far as I can see, 'he' must be 'the latter', but how could he teach what he does not know? The mistake is in the translation of ἐκείνου by 'the latter', in opposition to the rule that ἔκεινος refers to the one further away, i.e. the first named. The *Father* is introduced as if He does not know, and the son (τούτου) as providing Him instruction.

In lines 434 ff. Severian argues that before the beginning of time, i.e. before Adam's sin, the incarnation of Christ had been foreseen by God. Severian uses here the verb προτυπόω (τὰ ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ πρὸ τοῦ 'Αδαμ προτετυπώμενα ... καὶ τὴν χάριν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων προτετυπωμένην. See also 399: Πρῶτον ἐτυπώθη τὰ κατὰ τὴν σάρκα τοῦ Χριστοῦ). The author translates this verb by 'prefigure'. Now normally this verb is used of figures of the Old Testament in relation to those of the New Testament, particularly of Christ. On page 145 the author speaks of Adam as a τύπος. In the cases discussed here the τύπος is in God's mind. Is it wise to use the term 'prefiguration' here? At the very least the author should have stressed that we have here a remarkable kind of prefiguration. The Latin translation of the Greek words quoted above in Migne (quae de Christo ante Adam *decreta fuere* ... et gratiam evangelii ante saecula aeterna *praestitutam*, and Primo *statuta fuit*

Christi incarnatio) shows awareness of the problem and avoids the term *praefiguratio* (The author should have paid more attention to the translation in Migne. Most of errors mentioned so far could then have been avoided.)

Finally, on three occasions (148, 227, 245) one finds in the text a simple rhetorical expression, which is printed as οἷον τί λέγω; This expression is dealt with by the translator in a curious way. The first time it is rendered by 'Let me give an example', the second by 'Let me explain this', and the third by 'Shall I tell you what that means'. These are explanations rather than translations. Severian puts a question, and this question is simply: 'What do I say', or 'What do I mean to say?'. It is a normal rhetorical technique for introducing an explanation. The author considers the pronoun τι as interrogative and puts an acute accent on it. However, what does οἷον then mean? Montfaucon (Migne) writes: οἱόν τι λέγω; Οἷον is an (indirect) interrogative pronoun here, and τι is enclitic. A literal translation would thus be: 'What kind of thing am I saying?'. The author does not mention this reading of Migne in the apparatus, and when he finds this expression accentuated in that way in an article of B. Marx, he adds a (*sic*) on page 174. He seems to consider the undoubtedly correct reading as a printing error.

This list of remarks concerning the translation may perhaps create the impression that the reviewer has a rather low appreciation of the book under discussion. This is certainly not the case. The author presents a good critical text of the homily, he discusses the manuscript tradition in a clear fashion, he convincingly defends the authenticity of the homily, he gives a sound analysis of the sermon. The addition of a translation was an excellent idea. In general this translation is correct, but at some places it displays weaknesses. The remarks made above are meant as a contribution to an exact rendering of this interesting homily, which the author has very commendably made accessible to the modern reader.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106 J. C. M. VAN WINDEN

Jeremy Driscoll, O.S.B., *The* 'Ad Monachos' *of Evagrius Ponticus. Its Structure and a Select Commentary* (Studia Anselmiana 104). Roma 1991. XII, 432 p.

Evagrius' *Ad Monachos* is a collection of 137 proverbs, which are meant as a guide for a monk on his way to perfection. The author,

himself a monk, discusses the proverbs from within his own monastic experience. The result is a work which shows a deep insight in this particular kind of literature.

After an introductory chapter on Evagrius' teachings and the relationship of *Ad Monachos* to other Evagrian texts, the author gives the Greek text of *ad Monachos*, each saying being followed by an English translation.

The structure of the proverbs is far from obvious. The author shows how knowledge of the Trinity is the goal of monastic discipline and how the order of the proverbs reflects a monk's spiritual progress as conceived by Evagrius. "It begins with the first of the virtues, faith, and ends with the mind presented before the Trinity" (p. 158).

The next chapter examines the individual proverbs and is obviously the result of thorough study and meditation.

The last chapter situates this kind of literature, its relation with Scripture, with the words of the other Desert Fathers, and with ancient philosophy. It is evident that the *Ad Monachos* has its philosophic counterpart in *The Meditations* of Marcus Aurelius. The author discusses this relationship between Evagrius and ancient philosophy following in the footsteps of P. Hadot's *Exercises spirituels et philosophie antique*. Just like Hadot, the author is of the opinion that "even if what Christianity assimilated from this (philosophic) tradition is indeed very much, it must equally be recognized that the final synthesis is essentially Christian" (p. 378).

One cannot but be thankful for this fine guide into a special kind of Christian literature.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106 J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

Robert Beulay, *L'enseignement spirituel de Jean de Dalyatha, mystique syro-oriental du viiie siècle* (Théologie historique 83). Paris, Beauchesne, 1990. 523 pp. FF 330.00.

Father Beaulay has devoted most of his scholarly life to the study of the VIIIth century Nestorian monk and mystic John of Dalyatha, whose works until recently were almost totally unknown. In 1974 Father Beaulay presented a substantial dissertation about John and his mystical thought at the Sorbonne. In 1987 he published the former part under the

title, *La Lumière sans forme. Introduction à l'étude de la mystique chrétienne syro-orientale* (Chevetogne, 1987). The second part forms the present monograph and is based on a thorough reading and analysis of John of Dalyatha's mystical writings, Letters and Homilies, which he edited in the Patrologia Orientalis.

The structure of this study concentrates on the Homilies 2-6 that are a distinct group in John's entire oeuvre and describe the three stages of the spiritual life: purification, illumination, and union with God. In particular, Homily 6 is important, since it summarizes the foregoing ones. John of Dalyatha has been clearly influenced by ps. Dionysius' Mystical Theology. Besides ps.Dionysius the Areopagite, John's spiritual teaching was affected by Evagrius of Pontus, especially his distinction between the *praktikè* and the *gnostikè*, of which the *gnostikè* comprises the *physikè* as well as the *theologikè*. Purification with John of Dalyatha corresponds to Evagrius' *praktikè*, whereas union with God corresponds to Evagrius' *gnostikè*. The driving force of John's spiritual thought is love, which makes the monk conform his whole behaviour to God's will. The stage of purification therefore is dominated by love; the stages of illumination (sanctification) and the final union with God are the way of desire leading to the final *unio mystica* (cf. Averil Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire. The Development of Christian Discourse*, 1991, p. 220).

After an introductory chapter in which Father Beulay specifies this framework of John's spiritual teaching for the monk entering the religious life, he provides his readers with a very careful and painstaking analysis and description of the three spiritual stages in the following three main parts of his study. Each part comprises several chapters considering specific aspects of the spiritual life. Under the heading purification Father Beulay treats a variety of subjects including penitence, fasting, solitude, humility, prayer, and the fight with the demons. Sanctification and illumination encompass spiritual silence, intelligence through contemplation, and impassibility *(apatheia)*. The last part devoted to union with God mainly deals with the vision of God, the apex of the spiritual life, as well as death and the condition of the souls until the final resurrection. A synod called by the patriarch Timothy I in 786/7 condemned John of Dalyatha for his concept of the vision of God, namely that the divinity is visible. This view would imply that the earthly Jesus was able to see God the Son, which according to the tradition of the School of Antioch and of the Nestorian Church is impos-

sible. This chapter (pp. 424-464) which is one of the highlights of this study, is very instructive and well-written.

Fahter Beulay gives extensive quotations from the relevant writings of John of Dalyatha to support his arguments and to endorse his views. He constantly compares John of Dalyatha's views with those of Joseph Hazzaya, Evagrius, and John of Apamea in order to provide the right background for his spiritual teachings. In this way Father Beulay lays the foundations for a comprehensive study of mysticism in the East Syrian Church, which is a real desideratum (for Joseph Hazzaya see now: G. Bunge, *Rabban Jausep Hazzaya: Briefe über das geistliche Leben und verwandte Schriften. Ostsyrische Mystik des 8. Jahrhunderts*, Sophia 21, Trier 1982; Sebastian Brock will publish all the extant writings of Isaac of Nineveh in the near future). In an appendix, Father Beulay publishes a French translation of John's Homily 25, *On the contemplation of the Holy Trinity*, which contains his theological views that were anathematized by Timothy I in 786/7. It would have been helpful, if he also had given a complete translation of Homily 6, wich runs as a red thread through this wonderful book. Father Beaulay has published a learned, well-written basic study of an intriguing Syrian mystic, which deserves a much wider public than the small circle of specialists in Syriac and the history and theology of the Nestorian Church.

Department of Languages and Cultures of the Middle East
University of Groningen
Oude Kijk in't Jatstraat 26
9712 EK *Groningen*

H.J.W. DRIJVERS

BOOKS RECEIVED

The inclusion of a book in this list, which contains all books received by the editors, does not guarantee its subsequent review.

Elisabeth A. Clark, The Origenist Controversy. The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate. Princeton University Press, 1992.

Heikki Kotila, Memoria mortuorum. Commemoration of the departed in Augustine (Studia Ephemerides «Augustianum»). Institutum Patristicum «Augustinianum», Via S. Uffizio 25, 00193 Roma 1992. 219 p.

Michele Di Marco, Concordanza del De Anima di Cassiodoro (Bibliotheca Vivariensis 1). Rubbettino Editore, 1992. Viale dei Pini, 8. 88049 Soveria Mannelli. 870 p. L. 180.000.

R.W.L. Moberly, The Old Testament of the Old Testament. Patriarchal Narratives and Mosaic Yahwism (Ouvertures to Biblical Theology). Fortress Press, Minneapolis, 1992.

Aline Pourkier, L'hérésiologie chez Épiphane de Salamine (Christianisme Antique 4), Paris, Beauchesne, 1992. 539 p. 570 FF.

Jack Finegan, The Archeology of the New Testament. The Life of Jesus and the Beginning of the Early Church. Revised Edition. Princeton University Press, Princeton New Jersey. (A completely revised and updated edition of an authoritative handbook).

Daniel Vigne, Christ au Jourdain. Le Baptême de Jesus dans la tradition judéo-chrétienne. Préface du P. Tomáš Špidlík s.j. (Études Bibliques, nouv. sér. 16). Paris, J. Gabalda et Cie, 1992. 362 p. 430 F.

J. van Oort und U. Wickert (edd.), Christliche Exegese zwischen Nicaea und Chalcedon. Kampen, Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1992.

Richard J. Cassidy, John's Gospel in New Perspective. Christology and the Realities of Roman Power. Orbis Books, Maryknoll, New York 10545, 1992. 132 p. $18.95 Pb, $ 39.95 Cl.

Shafiq AbouZayd, Iḥidayutha. A Study of the Life of Singleness in the Syrian Orient. From Ignatius of Antioch to Chalcedon 451 A.D. (ARAM Society for Syro-Mesopotamian Studies). Oxford 1993.

Renate Pillinger, Andreas Pülz, Hermann Vetters (edd.), Die Schwarzmeerküste in der Spätantike und im frühen Mittelalter. Referate des dritten gemeinsam mit dem Bulgarischen Forschungsinstitut in Österreich veranstalteten Symposions. Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Wien, 1992.

Duro Basler†, Spätantike und frühchristliche Architektur in Bosnien und der Herzegowina. Redigiert von Renate Pillinger, Andreas Pülz, Hermann Vetters. Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Wien, 1993.

Giuliano Imperatore, Alla madre degli Dei. Edizione critica, traduzione e commento a cura di Valerio Ugenti (Università degli Studi di Lecce. Dipartimento di filologia classica e medioevale. Testi e studi 6). Congedo Editore, 1992.

Sancti Aureli Augustini Opera. Sect. VI, Pars VII: De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus manichaeorum libri duo (C.S.E.L. Vol. XC), recensuit Johannes B. Bauer. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1992.

J. Teixidor, La filosofía traducida. Crónica parcial de Edesa en los primeros siglos (Estudios Orientales 4). Editorial AUSA, Sabadell, 1991. 210 p.

Joan E. Taylor, Christians and the Holy Places. The myth of Jewish-Christian Origins. Oxford Clarendon Press, 1993. 384 p. £ 45.00.

Yves-Marie Blanchard, Aux sources du canon, le témoignage d'Irénée. Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1993. 363 p.

Remco F. Regtuit, Severian of Gabala. Homily on the incarnation of Christ (CPG 4204). Diss. VU University Press, Amsterdam, 1992. Hfl. 75,00; $ 50; £ 32.50.

Aloys Grillmeier, Le Christ dans la tradition chrétienne. Tome II/1: L'Église de Constantinople au VIe siècle (Cogitatio Fidei 172). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1993. 742 p. 450 F. Traduction de l'édition allemande, publiée en 1989. Titre original: Jesus der Christ im Glauben der Kirche.

Les Apophthegmes des Pères. Collection systématique, Chapitres I-IX. Introduction,

texte critique, traduction, et notes par † Jean-Claude Guy, s.j. (Sources Chrétiennes 387). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf 1993. 452 p. 218 F.

Graham Gould, The Desert Fathers on Monastic Community (Oxford Early Christian Studies). Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1993. VIII, 202 p. £ 27.50.

Paul Rorem, Pseudo-Dionysius. A Commentary on the Texts and an Introduction to Their Influence. New York-Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1993. XIII, 267 p. £ 32.50.

The Apostolic Fathers. Greek Texts and English Translations of Their Writings. Second Edition. Translated by J. B. Lightfoot and J. R. Harmer. Edited and Revised by Michael W. Holmes, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan 49516, 1992. XIII, 609 p.

Dieu peut-il avoir un fils. Le débat trinitaire du IVe siècle. Introduction et commentaires par Bernard Sesboüé. Textes traduits par Bernard Meunier et Bernard Sesboüé (Textes en main). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf. 1993. 240 p. 120 F.

Theodore de Bruyn, Pelagius's Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. Translated with Introduction and Notes (Oxford Early Christian Studies). Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1993. 236 p.

J. Rebecca Lyman, Christology and Cosmology. Models of Divine Activity in Origen, Eusebius and Athanasius (Oxford Theological Monographs). Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1993.

Origène, Homélies sur les Juges. Texte de la version latine de Rufin. Introduction, traduction, notes et index par Pierre Messié, s.j. Louis Neyrand, s.j. Marcel Borret, s.j. (Sources Chrétiennes 389). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1993. 248 p. 215 F.

José Fernando Toribio Cuadrado, «El Viniente». Estudio exegético y teológico del verbo "ΕΡΧΕΣΘΑΙ" en la literatura joánica (Monografias de la Revista «Mayécetica», 1) PP. Augustinos Recolitos,31340 Marcilla (Navarra), España.

Hubertus R. Drobner, "Für Euch bin ich Bischof". Die Predigten Augustins über das Bischofsamt (Sermones 335/K, 339, 340, 340/A, 383 und 396. Einleitung und Übersetzung). Würzburg, Augustinus-Verlag, 1993. 140 S. DM 28,—.

Psallendum. Miscellanea di Studi in onore del Prof. Jordi Pinell i Pons, O.S.B. A cura di Hildebrando Scicolone, O.S.B. (Studia Anselmiana 105. analecta Liturgica 15). Roma 1993.

Adam Kamesar, Jerome, Greek Scholarship and the Hebrew Bible. A Study of the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim (Oxford Classical Monographs). Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1993. XIII, 221 p. £ 30.00.

Richard Hillier, Arator on the Acts of the Apostles. A Baptismal Commentary (Oxford Early Christian Studies). Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1993. XI, 222 p. £ 30.00.

René Braun, Approches de Tertullien. Vingt-six études sur l'auteur et sur l'oeuvre (1955-1990). (Collection des Études Augustiniennes. Série Antiquité 134). Paris, Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1992. (Outre 24 artides déjà publiés antérieurement deux inédits: 'Bible et latin des chrétiens', 'État des travaux sur la langue de Tertullien (1960-1975)', et quelques 'Addenda et Corrigenda').

Bibliotheca Basiliana Universalis. A Study of the Manuscript Tradition of the Works of Basil of Caesarea. I. The Letters. By Paul Jonathan Fedwick (Corpus Christianorum). Turnhout, Brepols, 1993 XLII, 755 p.

La Sagesse de Balahvar. Une vie christianisée du Bouddha, traduit du géorgien, présenté et annoté par Annic et Jean-Pierre Mahé (Connaissance de l'Orient). Éditions Gallimard, 1993. 155 p.

E. P. Meijering, Von den Kirchenvätern zu Karl Barth. Das altkirchliche Dogma in der 'Kirchlichen Dogmatik'. Amsterdam, Verlag Dieben, 1993. 513 S.

Gennaro Luongo, Lo specchio dell'agiografo. S. Felice nei carmi XV e XVI di Paolino di Nola. (Parva Hagiographica 3). Nuove Edizioni Tempi Moderni, Napoli (1993). 122 p. L. 20.000.

Jacobus de Voragine, The Golden Legend. Readings on the Saints. Translated by William Granger Ryan. 2 Volumes. Princeton University Press, Princeton N.J. 391, 400 p.

The Seventh Century in the West-Syrian Chronicles. Introduced, translated and annotated by Andrew Palmer; including two seventh-century Syriac apocalyptic texts, introduced, translated and annotated by Sebestian Brock; with added annotation and an historical introduction by Robert Hoyland (Translated Texts for Historians, Vol. 15). Liverpool, University Press, 1993. LXVI, 305 p. £ 10.00.

Christian Faith and Greek Philosophy in Late Antiquity. Essays in Tribute to George Christopher Stead. In Celebration of his Eightieth Birthday 9th April 1993. Edited by Lionel R. Wickham and Caroline P. Bammel, assisted by Erica C. S. Hunter (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 19). Leiden, Brill, 1993. X, 266 p.

F. R. Trombley, Hellenic Religion and Christianization C. 370-529. (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 115/1). Leiden-New York- Köln, E. J. Brill, 1993 XIV, 344 p.

Le Cynisme ancien et ses prolongements, sous la direction de Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé et Richard Goulet. Actes du Colloque International du CNRS (Paris 22-25 juillet 1991). Presses Universitaires de France, 1993. XII, 612 p.

Le saint prophète Élisée, d'après les Pères de l'Église. Textes présentés par les carmelites du Monastère Saint Élie. Préface d'Olivier Clément (Spiritualité Orientale, n° 59). Abbaye de Bellefontaine, F-49122 Bégrolles-en-Mauges (Marne-&-Loire). 459 p.

Topographie Chrétienne des cités de la Gaulle des origines au milieu du VIIIe Siècle. VIII: Province ecclésiastique de Sens (Lugdunensis Senonia) par Jean-Charles Picard et Brigitte Beaugard, Noël Duval, Elzbieta Dabrowska, Patrick Périn, Christine Delaplace et Luce Pietri. De Broccard, 11, rue de Médicis, 75006. Paris, 1992.

Marco Rizzi, Ideologia e retorica negli 'exordia' apologetici. Il problema dell' 'altro' (II-III secolo) (Studia Patristica Mediolanensia 18). Vita e Pensiero. Pubblicazioni dell' Università Cattolica, Milano, 1993. XXX, 232 p.

Grégoire le Grand, Commentaire sur le Premier Livre des Rois. Tome II (II, 29-III, 37). Texte, traduction et notres par Christophe Vuillaume, O.S.B. (Sources Chrétiennes 391). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1993. 342 p. 145 F.

Cyrille d'Alexandrie, Lettres Festales VII-XI. Tome II. Sous la direction de Pierre Évieux. Texte grec par W. H. Burns, traduction et annotation par Louis Arragon, Pierre Évieux, Robert Monier (Sources Chrétiennes 392). Paris. Les Éditions du Cerf, 1993. 327 p. 202 F.

Versus de Sodoma. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento a cura di Luca Morisi. Pàtron Editore, Bologna. 1993. 157 p. L. 20.000.

Louis H. Feldman, Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World. Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian. Princeton University Press, Princeton N.J. XII, 68 p.

Gillian Clark, Women in Late Antiquity. Pagan and Christian Lifestyles. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1993. 160 p. £ 22.50.